

# The Reformed Church Review

---

Volume 3

OCTOBER, 1924

Number 4

---

## I

### THE HUGUENOTS AND AMERICAN LIFE

HENRY H. RANCK

The Huguenot-Walloon New Netherland Tercentenary was observed last spring with a number of notable celebrations under the direction of a commission which was instituted by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. It was analogous to the Pilgrim Tercentenary observed 3½ years earlier and called attention to these continental protestants, who were "pilgrims" too, and no less important for the life of our nation than the founders of New England.

In May or June, 1624, there arrived at the mouth of the Hudson River a ship of the Dutch West India Company, the *New Netherland*, with 32 families on board, mostly Walloons. This group about the same size as that which came to Plymouth Rock on the *Mayflower*, were the first permanent settlers in the Middle States and the first permanent Huguenot settlers in the United States. Some of them remained on Manhattan Island and were the real founders of what is now New York City. These Walloons were French-speaking Protestants of the Reformed faith. They had been living for a number of years side by side with the English Pilgrims in Leyden, where the tolerant, hospitable Dutch had furnished asylum for persecuted Protestants.

This Walloon colony was not the first effort to settle French Protestants in America, however. Admiral Coligny, the great Huguenot leader and statesman of vision, made several attempts to found colonies of his co-religionists on this side of the Atlantic, but they came to nought. The first attempt was by Villegagnon, a naval officer who sailed from France with two ships in 1555 and established a colony at Rio de Janeiro. Religious disputes arose. The leader himself sided with the Roman Catholics and in a few years the colony was destroyed by the Portuguese. In 1562 Coligny sent Jan Ribaut on a similar expedition. He established a colony of twenty-six people near the present Beaufort, South Carolina. This enterprise was soon abandoned. In 1564 Loudonniere founded a colony at the St. John's River, Florida. Ribaut took command of it the following year; but soon thereafter, nearly the entire colony was massacred by the Spaniards under Menendez. In 1604 a settlement of Huguenots was effected at Port Royal, Nova Scotia, and a few years later another at Quebec, both under the leadership of de Monts, a French Protestant nobleman. There were other little settlements along the St. Lawrence but they soon passed to Jesuit control. The religious liberty assured was ere long forbidden and most of these pioneers scattered to New England and other colonies.

Who are these Walloons, whose is the distinction of founding the most populous city of the planet? They are descendants of the Gallic Belgæ of whom Cæsar wrote—now about four millions of them in their ancestral home and the line between France and Belgium passes through their territory—about three millions on the Belgian side and one million on the French side. They all speak French. They are an alert, energetic, open-minded folk—artisans in large numbers. When the principles of the Reformation spread over Europe like wild fire in the early decades of the sixteenth century, many Walloons became Protestant and

very soon suffered persecution at the hands of Roman Catholic sovereigns. Walloon means stranger, so called by their neighbors to the south because they are racially different. A group of these Walloons, fleeing persecution, spent a number of years in Leyden. Their leader was the Walloon Jesse de Forest, under whom they left for the New World, expecting, like the Pilgrims in the *Mayflower*, to come to Virginia, but landing further north, as we have noted.

These Protestant Walloons, being French-speaking, come under the general designation Huguenots, the term by which the French Reformed Church is ordinarily known. Indeed the Dutch-speaking Protestant Flemings resident in Belgium were sometimes called Huguenots, too. There are various explanations of the word, which was used first about 1560 and was soon widely applied to these new French religionists. It arose apparently at Tours, whose patron saint was King Hugo, at whose gate the Protestants secretly assembled at night for worship and hence derisively received this name. So many of the honored names of religious groups were first given in contempt—even that of Christian itself.

The revival of learning preceded the Reformation in all countries. It put people into a mood of expectancy for new truth and prepared the way to the scriptures in the original, and for the translation in the vernacular. Jacques Lefevre was the leader of this Humanist movement among the French-speaking people. As early as 1507 he consecrated his learning to the study of the scriptures and in 1512 published a commentary and translation of the Pauline epistles which anticipated a number of Luther's ideas. In 1523 he produced a French translation of the New Testament which had wide circulation and made a profound impression. He espoused most of the Reformation ideas but was of a mystic, pacific temper, unfitted to lead a revolt and so remained in the Roman Church.

Through the circulation of the scriptures and literature, by the activities of secret missionaries and colporteurs, the new evangelical views spread so that by the death of King Francis I in 1547, every section of France, save Brittany, had its secret Protestants and some sections swarmed with them. The movement appealed especially to the upper, more intelligent classes, and never got a grip on the rank and file, like the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland. Moreover, a goodly number of the nobility espoused the new views and so the movement became entangled in bitter politics, in feuds of powerful families, a circumstance most unfortunate.

John Calvin, exiled in Geneva, was nevertheless the molding spirit of the church in his native land. His *Christian Institution*, published in 1536, crystalized Protestant thinking into a form of offense and defense. With the foresight and insight of the great statesman that he was, he urged the unity and organization of the French churches, a thing most needful in the storm of persecution and it was being effected during the decade preceding his death.

What an unspeakable ordeal these Huguenots passed through during a period of 250 years until, on the eve of the French Revolution, an edict of Toleration gave them not only religious liberty, but every right and privilege of French citizenship. One wonders that they did not disappear altogether. They were like the "Burning Bush," as a symbol represented them—burning but not consumed.

It is difficult to grasp vividly and clearly the happenings and experiences of these Protestants during these two and one-half centuries. There are four distinct periods: (1) The beginning of the Reformation to the outbreak of the wars of Religion in 1562; (2) these wars continue for a generation and are terminated by the Toleration Edict of Nantes in 1598; (3) a period of stability and security ensues for a generation or more and then follow encroach-



ments on their liberties, culminating in the revolution of the Edict of Nantes in 1685; (4) then an awful ordeal, nigh unto annihilation, but they live on and finally secure full freedom as a church.

During the early years of the Reformation, the people who were bold enough to express views at variance with those of the Roman church suffered severely. The first conspicuous martyr was Jean LeClerk, burned at the stake in 1525. Great numbers were burned alive, hanged or beheaded and many were scourged and cast into prison. Calvin had to flee Paris in 1533. In spite of political and ecclesiastical opposition, the Huguenots increased and solidified into a synodical organization and numbered about three hundred thousand, as Calvin claimed in 1559. A census taken about this time showed that there were 2,150 Protestant congregations in France, varying in size from a mere handful of believers to a community of thousands in a provincial center and served by several pastors.

By this time the whole kingdom was convulsed and divided on the religious question—the Romanists led by the Duke of Guise and Constable Montmorency; the Huguenots by the Prince of Conde and Admiral Coligny. There were various outbreaks, but the massacre of Vassey, March 1, 1562, in which sixty-three were treacherously killed and over one hundred wounded, made civil war inevitable. Calvin denounced armed intervention: "If one drop of blood is shed in such a revolt, rivers will flow; it is better that we all perish than cause such a scandal to the cause of Christ and his Evangel." The Protestants, however, were so embittered that they could not be restrained. Iconoclasm became rife. Calvin and Beza both pled passionately against attacks on churches, images and relics, but to no avail. Conde and Coligny, hearing that their soldiers were attacking a church in Orleans, hastened to restrain them. Conde pointed an arquebus at a soldier on a church roof about to shatter an image, and ordered him to desist.

The soldier went right on, saying, "Sire, have patience with me till I destroy this idol, and then let me die, if it be your pleasure." The slaughter of men seemed to shock people less than the sack of churches and the growing sympathy for the persecuted Protestants was checked by their deeds of violence. The most shocking event in all this period was the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day in August, 1572. It began in Paris and extended for several weeks throughout the kingdom. About seventy thousand persons were killed, among them Coligny and other Huguenot leaders. This bitter period of religious and civil war, mollified now and then by spaces of truce and armistice, culminated in the promulgation of the Edict of Nantes, April 13, 1598. This granted liberty of conscience everywhere within the realm, the right of private worship, the privilege of holding public office, and entry into universities and schools and hospitals. The Huguenots were permitted to maintain one church in the vicinity of every town with the exception of Paris. A limited freedom this, but under it the Huguenots flourished for a half century. They were loyal to the crown and rendered signal military and other service to the nation, which was highly appreciated, even by the Roman Catholics in authority.

In 1655 a group of the Roman clergy met to discuss religious questions. They expressed disapprobation of the religious liberty accorded the Protestants, urged the government to take measures to prevent their progress and "if the royal authority can not cut it off at a single blow, that it do its utmost to enfeeble and destroy it, little by little." A policy in accord with these views was soon inaugurated by the government in direct contravention of the Edict of Nantes; all Protestants were declared ineligible for appointment to any public office. They were excluded from the bar and practice of medicine, from becoming printers or book sellers. National and provincial synods were forbidden to convene and Huguenot church property was confis-

cated. More and more severe became the restrictions and persecutions. The most detested was that which in 1681 authorized the "conversion" of any Huguenot child over seven years of age, by forcibly taking it away from parents and placing it in a Roman Catholic institution. Exodus from the country began as soon as these severe measures were inaugurated and prior to the revocation of the Edict, it is estimated that 250,000 Huguenots fled the country. The death penalty and, afterward, the galleys and prison, awaited those intercepted in flight. Their property, too, was confiscated and their nationality lost.

Louis XIV signed the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, October 18, 1685, the terms of which required that all Huguenot churches be demolished, all religious meetings forbidden, all Protestant schools closed, and all ministers of the Reformed Church were to leave the country within a fortnight. All Protestant children were to be brought up as Roman Catholics and the penalties against expatriation were reconfirmed. The heads of Huguenot families were called on to abjure, and that quickly, or troops were to be quartered in their houses. These troops were encouraged to inflict every treatment save rape and murder. They wasted provisions, destroyed furniture, insulted inmates. At first it was difficult to get signatures, but resistance meant imprisonment, confiscation of property, and loss of the children by their confinement in Catholic institutions. So horrible were these persecutions that practically all members of the Reformed Church abjured, even though they fled the country later. This diabolical use of troops was the infamous "dragonnade." The great majority of Huguenots made frantic efforts to leave the country, a most difficult matter, because of the closely guarded coasts and frontiers; yet, a large number, through terrible privations and exposure, did escape, though many died of fatigue and disease, or were killed by the guards and many more were put in prison. The whole business seems an incredible story, looking back upon it but a few centuries.

Hundreds of thousands of Huguenots, however, refused to leave their native land or give up their Protestant faith. They became Catholics under duress and refused to perform the religious duties of the Roman Church or attend its services. They kept up their own worship and prayers in their homes. The ecclesiastics persisted in their efforts to make genuine Roman Catholics out of them, but they met with meager success. In case of serious illness, a priest would force his way into a home and urge the viaticum. Refusing this and dying in the Protestant faith, these persons were denied decent burial, bodies sometimes being cast into sewers or exposed in nudity to the desecrations of the mob and then thrown on a refuse place with dead animals and offal. Interment was sometimes permitted but it had to be at night in some unfrequented place and not in a cemetery. If a child was perchance taken to a Roman church for baptism, the record made by the priest of the christened child was "the bastard son (or daughter) of ——— and his concubine." Systematic abduction of the Protestant children continued, the most horrible of all the horrors of this terrible period. "For more than two generations the evil specter of a possible seizure of their offspring haunted every French Protestant household in which children dwelt." Can we find anywhere in history a finer heroic devotion to the faith than we see in this group of Huguenots who would not yield but persisted in loyalty to the truth as they saw it. With noble courage and devotion many Huguenot ministers and lay preachers jeopardized their lives by going from place to place holding secret meetings in quarries, in woods, by the seashore and out of the way places. Nearly all of them finally perished on the scaffold. This early part of the eighteenth century was the period of the "Church in the Desert," when the Romanists claimed to have exterminated the Protestants. A great leader arose among the Huguenots and wrought so wonderfully that he has been called

the "Restorer of Protestantism in France"—Antoine Court, who as a youth spoke at the secret meetings "in the dens and caves of the earth," then systematized these surreptitious activities and in 1715 convoked the first "Synod of the Desert." A price was set on his head and he had to flee the country in 1729. He established a college at Lausanne, Switzerland, for the education of the clergy and from this institution came all the pastors for the Huguenots till the close of the eighteenth century.

The liberalizing spirit rife among progressive nations at the time of the American Revolution finally brought relief. In February, 1785, Lafayette wrote Washington: "The French Protestants are the victims of an intolerable despotism; although for the moment not openly persecuted, their marriages are not legal; their wills are null in the eye of the law; their children are considered bastards and their persons are subjects for the gallows."

By the Edict which Louis XIV issued in November, 1787, the year of the adoption of our Federal Constitution, the various limitations and disabilities under which the Huguenots had suffered were removed. In 1801 Protestantism and Judaism became with Catholicism established religions with equal protection and a proportional measure of state support.

The French Protestants were in a sorry state at the beginning of the nineteenth century, with less than one hundred pastors. There are now over one thousand pastors and a constituency of nearly two millions, according to the Rev. Georges F. Lauga of Paris.

The Huguenots have had an importance and have exercised an influence on the various phases of French life far beyond their numerical strength. Says an authority on the subject: "The career of French Protestantism has been very closely interwoven with the modern political development of the country. Though a small minority, it has always been aggressive and resolute in maintaining its posi-

tion. Many distinguished men have appeared in its ranks throughout its history. In education, law, finance and reform it has taken a prominent part. In the founding of savings banks, the abolition of the slave trade, the revival of various industries, French Protestants have ever been foremost and to-day are a very influential element throughout France." The recently chosen President of France, Gaston Doumergue, is a Protestant.

The tendencies to liberty and political equality, so assertive in France since the French Revolution, were undoubtedly greatly gendered and fostered by the spirit and principles of the Huguenots. They were a powerful and persistent factor operative for the separation of church and state, effected in 1905. Theirs was ever in the main a salutary and important influence for sane and progressive theological thought. Says Dr. T. M. Lindsay: "French theology was always a counterpoise to the narrow Reformed scholastic of Switzerland and Holland."

We regard John Calvin as the founder of the presbyterial system of church government, though certain features of it in lay representation were practiced by Zwingli before him; but it was in France on the eve of the wars of religion that the system was worked out with a large measure of completeness. A consistory made up of pastor, elders and and deacons ruled the congregation. A group of congregations were constituted a unit over which was a colloquy composed of representatives from the consistories. This corresponded to our Classis or Presbytery. Over the colloquies were the Provincial synods and over all the General or National Synod. Lindsay thinks this frame of church government "reconciled more thoroughly, than has ever been done since, the two principles of popular rights and supreme central control. Its constitution has spread to Holland, Scotland and to the great American churches. Their ecclesiastical polity came much more from Paris than from Geneva."

When a deed is done for Freedom,  
    through the broad earth's aching breast  
Runs a thrill of joy prophetic, trembling on from  
    east to west,  
And the slave where'er he cowers, feels the soul  
    within him climb.

The extraordinary heroism of the French Protestants through these terrible centuries has inspired all lovers of religious liberty everywhere, but especially in vigorous America. In their persistent determination to maintain the truth as they were convinced of it, they not only aided their own nationals but others as well; just as a successful experiment in Democracy in one country helps mightily, that "government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth." The Huguenot torch has "enlightened the world." We are interested especially, however, in these who fled France.

We have no means of knowing, even approximately, the number of Protestants who left France or the number of those who remained to become the "Church of the Desert." The estimates of the authorities are that between a half million to one million fled and from a half million to one million remained. The first edict to exterminate the heretics was issued in 1535 and three years thereafter the first church of Huguenot refugees was organized in Strasburg with 1,500 members, and with John Calvin as the pastor. The tide of emigration flowed intermittently for centuries, but at the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the exodus became a stampede. They went to Holland, England, Germany and Switzerland—also to Denmark and Sweden. They had at one time sixty-eight churches in Holland, more in Germany and nearly as many in England. London alone had twenty-two societies. It is said that in one week 1300 were counted treking their way through Geneva. These expatriated Protestants were the "church under the cross" as a famous symbol represented them; but the neighboring countries



welcomed them because they brought their exceptional skill as handicraftsmen, and became the best of citizens. They have been called the economic creators of Europe. Huguenot Walloons brought the science and arts of metallurgy to Sweden. The future industrial supremacy of England and the commercial greatness of Holland were due in no small measure to this enriching and stimulating influx. Progressive ideas of social and civic reform came with them. Almost without exception these Huguenots of what is now France and Belgium were skillful artisans and thrifty, forward-looking folk. One is amazed at the stupidity, idiocy indeed, of the French King and leaders in driving out this most valuable element of the population, impoverishing themselves and playing into the hands of their industrial rivals. After the Revocation edict, two-thirds of the factories and workshops of the kingdom were closed because of the flight of proprietors and employees.

The French are ardent lovers of their own land, but once in another country, they were disposed to adjust themselves to the situation and become assimilated and submerged in the life of the nation which harbored them. The second or third generation would speak almost altogether the language of the adopted country, loyal citizens of which they became. They joined the armies, and the churches likewise, of the lands in which they had come to dwell. There are many French and Walloon names to-day in these countries.

Holland especially was over-crowded with this influx and not a few had in them Coligny's dream, so sadly frustrated, of a free colony beyond the seas. Huguenots went with the Dutch to Cape Town and South Africa; others with a lingering love of native land went to the French island of St. Christopher in the West Indies, where, however, they were not free from the inveterate persecuting hand. The large migration into the American colonies is of special interest to us.

Sidney Lee, the Englishman of letters, has an interesting series of papers in *Scribner's Magazine* of 1907, under the general title "The Call of the West," as it affected Elizabethan England. The subject of one of them is "The Teaching of the Huguenots." He says: "England learned from French teachers the crowning conception of the new world as the unfettered land of freedom. It was in the Huguenot spirit that the Puritans of England, when penal legislation drove them from their homes, looked to America for protection and salvation. The vision of religious liberty in the new world was a Huguenot creation. The beginnings of New England were cast in the Huguenot mould. The Great American project of Puritan England differed from the French schemes in Brazil and Florida neither in motive nor in principle, but in practical achievement and enduring triumph. From the Colonial failures of Protestant France followed the Colonial successes of Protestant England."

Thus we see how even the abortive colonial attempts of Coligny and de Monts were not without effect on American life through their example and stimulus upon the Puritans of England. We have seen also how the first permanent Huguenot settlers in the United States were the Walloons who founded New York. Of the original thirty-two families who came on the *New Netherland*, the majority went up the Hudson to Fort Orange, now Albany. A few went into New Jersey. While the settlers in the Hudson valley were prevailingly Dutch, there was a sprinkling of Huguenots amongst them, but New Paltz, near the present site of New Kingston, and New Rochelle were distinct Huguenot centers and the latter place Dr. Wm. Elliot Griffis claims was the "largest single permanent colony of the Huguenots in America." Indicative of the important French contingent in New Netherland is the fact that official publications were in French as well as Dutch and this continued for a time after the English possession, which began in

1664. There were twenty-nine Reformed churches in New Netherland from 1628 to 1700 served by thirty-three ministers, most of them Dutch, of course, yet even the majority of these were university graduates and could preach in French. But at least one half dozen of this number were Walloons or French. Four of these officiated regularly in French and went as Dr. Griffis points out "from church to church as their services were needed—especially on Manhattan, Staten and Long Islands, and at Esopus, New Paltz, Wiltwick, Rondout, Schenectady, Kingston and New Rochelle."

There was a large contingent of Huguenots in South Carolina who came before and after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. They established the first church in Charleston in 1681 and are generally credited with being the founders of that city.

Virginia, too, became the asylum for a number, probably 10,000 and their first arrivals were by way of England in 1690. Nine years later came an expedition of 600 led by a French nobleman, Philip de Richebourg—"The largest single colony of refugees ever landed in America," claims the Rev. Ammon Stapleton. They located near what is now Richmond on the south side of the James River. Some of them later migrated into North Carolina.

As early as 1660 a few Huguenot families came to Salem, Massachusetts. By 1685 a French congregation was organized in Boston and soon thereafter, hundreds came to that port, many of them going into the interior. They founded the town of New Oxford, about seventy-five miles west of Boston. It was abandoned after a few years because of Indian attacks incited by the Romanists of Canada. Short-lived attempts at colonization were made on Narragansett Bay, R. I., and at Milford, Connecticut, on Long Island Sound.

It is claimed that as many as 15,000 Huguenots or persons of immediate Huguenot descent came to Pennsylvania

during the colonial period, the first distinctive group being that under the leadership of Madame Ferree. They settled at Pequea in Lancaster County in the early part of the eighteenth century. The pioneers of the Keystone state were largely Germans, Palatines, many of whose forebears were Huguenots who had escaped across the border into the Alsace and Rhine region where they were soon Germanized, and as such, came to America. Among the German speaking folk of eastern Pennsylvania and those of the same stock who pushed into western Pennsylvania, western Maryland and the Shenandoah valley of Virginia are a large number of unmistakable Huguenot names.

Into nearly every one of the thirteen original states of the nation came directly groups of these French Protestants and into practically all the sections of the country has gone their beneficent infusion. A conservative estimate puts the number who came to the colonies prior to 1750 at 50,000. Multitudes came as "redemptionists." Their sea passage and sometimes even the expense of their land travel on the continent was paid by the employers to whom they were bound in service until they had "redeemed" their passage money.

The Frenchman, intense lover that he is of his own land, yet when thrown among peoples of other race has manifestly a special gift of adjustment, and adaptation. This is particularly noticeable in the French relationships to the Indians of America. The Huguenots did not strive to isolate themselves in exclusive groups and perpetuate their language, customs and ideas as other nationals among us have done. They came to America to become Americans, which was by far the best thing for them and for this country. They soon lost their identity in the seething life of this nation, but their high character, energy and thrift were not dissipated. This merging into the body social and politic, like rivers into the great ocean makes it all the more difficult to evaluate their qualities, merits and influence, and

hence they have not been recognized and appreciated in the measure they deserve. They have had an unselfish, almost indifferent attitude touching their own virtues and importance and there has been little disposition until the last generation to decipher and narrate their story and tell of their worth. There was no Governor Bradford in New Netherland or any other of our Huguenot groups to record history as well as make it. Of course any nationality or church coming to this country and sacrificing, as it must and should, its own language, is bound to suffer from depreciation if not total eclipse. That has been the inevitable fate of the Huguenots in America. They must decrease that others may increase.

The Huguenots have been an element of enormous value to the nation. Says Henry Cabot Lodge, typical New Englander that he is, in an essay on the "Distribution of Ability in the United States," based on a careful analysis of *Appleton's Cyclopædia of American Biography*:

"Indeed we find that people of French blood exceed absolutely, in the ability produced, all the other races represented except the English and Scotch Irish, and show a percentage in proportion to their total original immigration much higher than that of any other race."

We can be sure that the Protestants among these French referred to have a percentage no less than that of the Roman Catholics. They excelled in all lines. Space does not permit giving the impressive array of our great names of Huguenots in statesmanship, arms, commerce, and philanthropy. Three of the five presidents of the Continental Congress were Huguenots—John Jay, Henry Laurens and Elias Boudinot. Dr. Griffis thinks "a majority of American fortunes, before 1800 made in commerce, were amassed by the Huguenot merchants."

The American immigration problem to-day is a serious one and much is said of the inferior quality and undesirability of certain peoples who come to our shores. That

has always been said by one group touching others who were different. Benjamin Franklin in 1751 protested against the coming of the Germans into Pennsylvania. He called them "Palatine Boors." "Why should Pennsylvania, founded by England, become a colony of aliens?" Yet out of Berks and adjoining counties, the very heart of that element, came the "First Defenders" of our nation's capital in 1861.

I do not believe that one race or nationality is essentially superior to another. One will be more advanced, civilized. It has had a combination of favorable circumstances, has been fortunate in leadership and heritage, has had a chastening, inspiring discipline. Some races are only in their infancy while others are mature or decadent. There are several oceans but only one great sea lapping all shores and the constituent make-up of its waters is essentially the same in all quarters, though in some sections the tides flow more strongly and rise higher, on some coasts the breakers are more vigorous and rampant. There are many races in humanity but only one species, as cross breeding in the physical realm and conscience in the moral realm prove. The potent, energetic, resourceful, abounding life of man works itself out variously with unique splendors in a glorious diversity in the different races through various ages and climes. Like the stars, one race differs from another in glory and who will say that any one is necessarily, essentially, and permanently inferior. We say this to free ourselves from the suspicion of any taint of the current and fashionable snobbishness which is afflicted with the superiority complex and thinks that we Caucasians, or in especial Nordics, have been eternally elected to boss all the humans on this little planet. Undoubtedly America was highly favored in the type of colonists who came here and founded this nation. They were picked groups. They came to a large extent for conscience' sake and their moral level was high. We have been wont to think of the New England

Pilgrims and Puritans as the typical and very finest type of these pioneers and not too much can be said in praise of them. The Huguenots had these very qualities too and more. The naturally amiable and adaptable French nature stiffened and strong and independent as it must be for those choosing Protestantism in a Roman Catholic country, was chastened in the fires of persecution, tempered in prolonged trial so that when it came to America it was a contingent of rare quality and great value. Those qualified to speak always refer to them with reverence and high appreciation.

They continued their inheritance and background of industry, skill, alertness, open-mindedness and aggressiveness. They were companionable, cheerful, buoyant, invariably friendly, and noted for their wit and humor and thus tended to mollify the severity and austerity of some of the other colonists. The Huguenots of France lived on a social level of unostentatious comfort for the most part and among them were many of the nobility, thousands of whom fled the country and some reached America. About them was an air of refinement which the exposures and privations of migration and the crudeness of pioneer life did not dispel. They had a love of the beautiful, of the finer side of life, which showed itself in the cultivation of flowers and in the artistic furnishing of their homes. Withal they lead the simple life. Says Dr. Griffis: "Throughout the whole spectrum of American history the critical scholar discerns the light hues of French blood, French taste, French refinement and French culture. In the colonial era, the interiors even of their frontier homes were neater and more attractive than those of the Dutch and English settlers. Instead of thick woolen, coarse cloth, or dowdy stuff at the windows, the glare of their 'lights,' whether of oiled parchment of greased paper, was tempered and mellowed with dainty white linen. On the floor, in place of sand and rushes, they spread textiles made of odds and ends of worn-out or discarded clothing or other dry goods. These,



woven in their looms, made what we call rag carpet—cheerful to look at and pleasant for the feet to tread upon.”

Spiritual freedom, ecclesiastical and civil liberty were a passion with the Huguenots. They were Puritans, too, but were not puritanic. There was a moderation and sanity in things religious, in keeping with their generous attitude in other phases of their living, a pliancy in the less essential things, but a fortitude and unyielding loyalty in the major claims of life. Calvin produced a liturgy, and simple liturgical worship was used by the Huguenots on the continent and also in colonial churches. Such practice and also the observance of the great festivals of the christian year were taboo among New England Puritans as smacking of popery. In Boston during the closing decade of the seventeenth century, Jean Daille, a great scholar, theologian and preacher, was the pastor of the French church and to his services native Bostonians were attracted. Dr. Baird tells the amusing story of an outstanding Puritan and his taking to task one of the offenders. It was Judge Samuel Sewall in whose diary is the record—“This day I spake with Mr. Newman about his partaking with the French Church on the 25th of December on account of its being Christmas day as they abusively call it.” Yet there was a commendable moral rigor we may be sure on this side of the Atlantic as in the Huguenot churches of England. In their church of Southampton is the record of a member suspended from the communion for selling a blind horse without making known the defect.

Tenacious of their own views, they yet had a liberality and forbearance in religious matters which doubtless helped to mould the beneficent American practice in this regard. Some Protestants when in power have persecuted those of different views and have endeavored to coerce them in religious thought and practice. Only very rarely have Huguenots shown the intolerant spirit.

There are doubtless upwards of a million citizens of the

United States of Huguenot descent. There is little direct evidence of their presence save the many unmistakable Huguenot names; but their beneficent, wholesome, tonic influence persists for the common good in the great melting-pot of American life.

It is well that we observe this Tercentenary of those whom Mrs. Sigourney thus memorializes—"that high-minded race, who for the sake of conscience made these western wilds their home"; who had

That firmness for the truth, that calm content  
With simple pleasure, that unswerving trust,  
In toil, adversity, and death, which cast  
Such healthful leaven 'mid the elements  
That peopled the new world.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

## II

### THE PLACE OF THE CHURCH IN OUR MODERN LIFE

LEE M. ERDMAN

According to the views of some so-called advanced intellectuals this subject does not merit discussion. The matter is a closed issue. To engage in it is love's labor's lost. To them the church is an anachronism in modern life, the projection of the shadow of a mighty mediæval institution across the threshold of a brighter and fairer day; or, to change the figure, it is likened to a rudimentary organ of the human body which once played a necessary part in the physiological processes of a previous age but is now quite useless, sometimes the seat of dangerous irritations and which the wise surgeon removes. The progress of science and culture, we are told, have undermined the foundations of her dogmas and her ethical standards are lower than those professed by other groups.

Mr. H. G. Wells, in *God, the Invisible King*, wrote: "The history of Christianity, with its encrustation and suffocation in dogmas and usages, its dire persecutions of the faithful by the unfaithful, its desiccation and unlovely decay, its invasion by robes and rites and all the tricks and vices of the Pharisees whom Christ detested and denounced, is full of warning against the dangers of a Church." Prof. J. S. Schapiro of the College of the City of New York, writing in the *Atlantic Monthly* for June, 1920, makes the bold assertion that "the intellectual . . . does not pay the church the compliment of being hostile to her . . . he simply ignores it as a force incapable of good or evil." The chanting of the funeral dirge of the church was one

of the favorite amusements of William Watson as indicated in the following couplet:

Outwardly splendid as of old—  
Inwardly sparkless, void and cold—  
Her force and fire all spent and gone—  
Like the dead moon she still shines on.

Let us not be unduly moved by this temper which most of us might consider to be nothing but supercilious cynicism. Diatribes about the church have been written in every age and examples more bitter and unjust than those of our contemporaries might be cited from the days of Celsus to Voltaire. Heckling the church is not exactly a new form of indoor amusement. Some who practice it, let us freely grant, are sincere and earnest, some perhaps are prophets, and rebuffed by the many shortcomings of the church, we half suspect, employ this method to stab her awake. Others in the spirit of levity or malignity would use this as a modern and refined form of persecution, more subtle than the ancient methods. But laughed out of court, as she repeatedly has been, the church returns, is still with us and demands a reckoning of those who would labor for the realization of highest ideals.

And there are friends of righteousness and those who love the Lord who are suspicious of the word "church." They would supplant it entirely by the term "the Kingdom of God." There are those who by temperament are intense individualists and to them all forms of organization smack of tyranny. The Spirit, they remind us, bloweth where it listeth, and all forms tend to throttle the spontaneous aspirations of the inner life. Freedom is with them the great watchword, forgetting however that Jesus also speaks of the yoke and of the knowledge and practice of the truth as being the prerequisites of the freedom of the children of God. There are serious students of social progress who question whether the church can furnish the ideals and the driving power necessary for the reconstruction of a shat-

tered world. The dead weight of tradition, they claim, is too great. The tenacious grip upon the past, the idolatrous treasuring of ancient creed and attitude make impossible a readjustment to modern forms of thought and the possession of a real consciousness of the pressing problems of life of this latter day. Better wipe the slate clean of its dreary tale and banish the haunting specters of the past who lure us from the upward way. Let men of good-will and of the social mind unite in organizing *de novo* those religious groups where man may find a spiritual foundation for his ethical life and the necessary encouragement for his practical endeavors.

Under cross fire from friend and foe the church occupies a very perilous position in modern life. One redoubt after another has been taken and presently the citadel itself, men fear, will fall. It surely is important then that we, who are servants of the church, should reëxamine her position and, with the psalmist, "walk about Zion, number the towers thereof, and mark well her bulwarks." It is surely important that we should reassess her strength and weakness and give thought to the position she shall take in the battle-line of to-morrow.

We shall not attempt to give a dogmatic definition of the church. The meticulous care which the fathers gave to this subject, finding the marks of the true church in a particular succession of the ministry, in adherence to a metaphysical creed, a particular polity or cultus, is hardly our mood to-day. We recall that many church bodies, scornfully referred to as sects by leaders of our own denomination a generation or two ago, and who were thought of as unworthy of notice or fellowship, have since justified their existence in a most striking way by the particular testimony they have borne to the truth and by their abundant labors of love. To-day we gladly extend the right hand of fellowship and receive them in the Federal Council of the Churches. Do we not then indicate that we have prof-

ited by the lessons of church history if we no longer adhere to the definitions conceived by the legal mind and born in the wranglings and compromises of church councils. Less exact but no doubt nearer the truth are we when we adopt the language of the heart and find refuge in religious imagination, in the metaphors and similes of Paul in speaking of the nature of the church. The community of believers in Jesus as Lord, of all time and place, made essentially one by the possession of a common faith and hope and love, unified by the consciousness of a common need, forgiveness of sins and the possession of the new life, bound together by the conviction that this is answered in the gifts of the Holy Spirit of God, unified moreover by the challenge of a common task, the applications of the principles of the Kingdom of God to all the relationships and spheres of life, corporate as well as individual, is not this the "pillar and ground of truth," "the household of faith" where we receive our finest nurture and give of our most precious gifts, is not this His body, that which is projected into time and space but still organically related to Him, suffused by a common life, governed by a common mind, animated by one purpose, to work the works of faith, the labors of love in the patience of hope?

We know of course that according to our records Jesus mentions the church only on two occasions and then in a rather casual way, and is ever speaking about the Kingdom. Paul, on the other hand, is constantly speaking of the church, and infrequently mentions the Kingdom. But we need not be perplexed. The organization of the church would follow the law of human need and development. The Spirit would fashion a body as it had need. Small wonder if the fashioning of this new vessel which should be the spiritual storehouse of the new Israel and the shaping of the new tools wherewith to work the works of God should have occupied so much of the Apostle's thought. The church is not an end in itself but a means to an end.

It preserves, on the one hand, through creeds, traditions, the lives of its saints, the memory of its great struggles, the garnered wisdom of the ages. We can envisage our duties of to-day and our hopes for to-morrow only when we have marked well God's footprints in the past and have rightly conned the lessons of history.

And again the church is the communion and fellowship which makes possible the development of rounded Christian character through sharing in its corporate life. It is an extension and continuation of the life of Jesus through those personalities that have been transformed by His grace and truth. And these furnish the weightiest argument for the gospel and its most potent testimony. It is this life which begets life. By its inescapable testimony we are impressed when all other arguments fail. Through the fellowship of the church we become the spiritual heirs of the saints of the ages. We know anew the meaning of the gospel as we study the different types of sainthood which it produced in different ages, the institutions which it created to give outward expression to its ideals and make possible a more efficient ministry, the mighty theological systems reflecting various racial tempers and contemporaneous thought forms. All these bear witness to the length and breadth of the gospel. We are saved from the perils of religious provincialism and the particular type of fanatical individualism to whom the winnowed wisdom of the ages means nothing, when we rightly assess, not with superstitious veneration, but with understanding and critical minds, our heritage as members of the universal Christian Church.

But some one has recently remarked that while a goodly portion of a three-year seminary course is occupied in studying church history which records the achievements of the church in the past, but a few hours are given, in comparison, in studying the tasks that confront the church to-day. To glorify the past and to live on its unearned increment, to be blissfully unconscious of a changing world



which demands new forms of thought and altered methods of Christian service, this has always been one of the dangerous attitudes of the church, which has alienated many of her gifted sons. She moves, but moves slowly. She does possess that which the biologist reminds us is a necessary capacity of every animal form that has kept pace with the evolutionary process, viz., the power of adaptation to the conditions of an altered environment. This inherent power of the church which enabled it to survive in its environment of Jewish legalism in its infancy, which preserved it during the days of its contact with the debased paganism and subtle philosophies of the Græco-Roman world, which enabled it to renew its powers of youth when it had become old and corrupt in the days of the Reformation, which moved it to rediscover the sacredness of human personality and all that this implies as it is revealed in the gospel of Jesus and which lies behind all the highest aspirations of the modern world—this inherent power of the gospel to meet the highest needs of a new age and not to be overcome, though sometimes maimed by its evils, this gives us new confidence to believe that the church will again find her necessary place as the teacher in the things of the spirit, as the conserver of the highest values amid all the revolutionary changes in the life of the Twentieth Century occasioned by scientific discovery and the altered conceptions of individual and social obligation.

For, it is proper now to ask, what are some of the characteristics of our modern life, which differentiate it from former periods, and in the midst of which we wish to find the proper place of the church? As a description of its most worth-while aspirations we may accept the statement of Professor Elwood (*Christianity and Social Science*, p. 172): "The social consciousness of our age obviously centers about two great movements—science and democracy. The search for truth and for social redemption distinguish the motives of our age from those of many, though of

course not all preceding ages. . . . The challenge which is given to religion to-day is the challenge of science on the one hand and the challenge of modern social unrest on the other."

If the chasm of misunderstanding that has separated many thoughtful people from the forms of religion represented by the church is to be bridged, it is absolutely necessary that religion come into closer accord with science. From science religion will learn much that is absolutely necessary if it is to make its appeal to the modern mind and understand the modern problems of life and, to men of scientific mind, religion, as we shall try to point out, will bring new inspiration and sustaining strength as it indicates the divine source of all truth and the ideal ends which all truths shall serve.

From science religion must learn respect for truth; from science she must learn the great lessons of the open mind which gladly receives truth regardless of its source, the hospitable mind which has place even for strange and unwelcome truths for which we had had no place in our complacent and well-rounded scheme of things. From the great scientists we learn the supreme worth of patient, untiring, fearless search for and advocacy of truth, regardless of the consequences involved. Some to whom the names of Darwin and Huxley are anathema might well sit at their feet and learn these first principles of straight thinking. What essential nobility of mind is reflected in the letters of Thomas Huxley to Charles Kingsley, where at one point he makes the following observation on the scientific method: "Science seems to me to teach in the highest and strongest manner the great truth which is embodied in the Christian conception of the entire surrender to the will of God. Sit down before facts as a little child, be prepared to give up every preconceived notion, follow humbly wherever and to whatever abysses nature leads or you shall learn nothing. I have only begun to learn content and peace of mind since

I have resolved at all risks to do this." Professor Sperry in his stimulating book, *The Disciplines of Liberty*, parallels the above citation by a quotation from the autobiographical memoir of Charles Darwin to illustrate the same humility and openmindedness: "I had, during many years, followed a golden rule, namely, that whenever a published fact, a new observation or thought came across me, which was opposed to my general results, to make a memorandum of it without fail and at once; for I had found by experience that such facts and thoughts were far more apt to escape from the memory than favorable ones. Owing to this habit of mind, very few objections were raised against my views which I had not at least noticed and attempted to answer. . . . As far as I can judge, I am not apt to follow blindly the lead of other men. I have steadily endeavored to keep my mind free so as to give up any hypothesis, however much beloved, as soon as facts are shown to be opposed to it." These are classic illustrations of the temper of the scientific mind at its best. It is becoming more and more to be the method of study characteristic of the modern university, college and high school. How does the attitude of the church in the study of the facts of religion and all the phenomena of life compare with that which we have just indicated? Is the position of the church one that inspires respect and confidence on the part of our studious young people, who have had an insight into the methods of science? Do they not receive the impression that the teachers of the church are evasive, that they are afraid to drag truth out into the light of day, that there are certain things that must be hidden as dangerous? They do not wish to be protected, especially by smoke-screens that hide the issue. The inevitable result with thinking young people who discover, for instance, that facts of history are frequently juggled and distorted to suit some theory of church history, who ponder upon the agelong warfare between science and religion, still in progress in many groups and communions,

who compare the characteristic zeal for truth of the clear scientific mind with the shiftiness and cloudiness of many teachers of the church is to give the impression that the church has nothing to offer which will stand the test of the modern critical mind. Sad indeed that the church should so far forget her impregnable position as the custodian of the deepest things of the soul and set up barriers of straw and spend much blood and gold defending them. How difficult for the humble inquirer to separate the treasure from the straw!

Perhaps science, which plays so large part in modern life, may rebuke the church for the lack of unity and comity between her many communions. The republic of science knows no racial and national barriers. In the year 1806, when England was at war with France, the French Academy awarded one of its highest prizes to Sir Humphrey Davy. In accepting it he used these significant words: "Science knows no country. If the two countries or governments are at war, the men of science are not. That would indeed be a civil war of the worst description. We should rather through the instrumentality of men of science soften the asperities of national hostility." Does not modern life require that the church shall have a lofty dignity inspired by a sense of her high calling in bearing witness to the gospel of the Son of God which shall unite her leaders, though they have no organic relations one with the other, in an essential unity of spirit and make of her membership a universal brotherhood in the Lord Jesus?

A new conviction has arisen in our hearts in these latter days that the church must rise above the influences that have throttled her voice in the past. She may not be the convenient publicity agent of the state and the agitator of war frenzy. She must think her own thoughts and courageously bear her own testimony. But, brethren, it comes with ill grace, and, I fear, makes but little impression upon the world when we adopt ringing antiwar resolutions when

all the while there is war between and within the churches. Practically all the sins of war-time propaganda are repeated in the distortions of fact, the insinuations of base motives, the resorting to inuendo practiced by many leading churchmen in the present fundamentalist controversy. The sins of competitive industry have frequently been condemned, and they will continue to be condemned, but we writhe beneath the stinging rebuke of the world as it is charged that rival congregations, particularly in small towns, practice a competitive system just as keen and often less ethical than the business firms of the community.

As an example of the ethical standards of one large and representative group of the medical profession, permit me to read to you a part of the Fellowship Pledge of the American College of Surgeons: . . . "In particular, I pledge myself to pursue the practice of surgery with thorough self-restraint and to place the welfare of my patients above all else; to advance constantly in knowledge by the study of surgical literature, the instruction of eminent teachers, interchange of opinion among associates, and attendance on the important societies and clinics; to regard scrupulously the interests of my professional brothers and seek their counsel when in doubt of my own judgment; to render willing help to my colleagues and to give freely my services to the needy. Moreover, I pledge myself, so far as I am able, to avoid the sins of selfishness; to shun unwarranted publicity, dishonest money-seeking, and commercialism as disgraceful to our profession; to refuse utterly all secret money trades with consultants and practitioners." This high code of ethics is practiced by the better element of the medical profession. Their eyes are upon us. We may well pause and examine ourselves as we realize that we are spiritual physicians to men of this type. Are we as diligently seeking self-improvement through study and mutual counsel? Do we make a point of practicing self-restraint and showing due regard for each other's opinions?

Do we make an effort to combat certain subtle forms of selfishness which are just as common and even more repellent in clerical life than in the medical profession? But, above all, and this is our present point, does not the catholicity of mind of the true scientist remind us that if the church is to maintain her position in the modern intellectual world there must be a willingness to learn one from the other on the part of her different families. We must be willing to sit in common council and, so far as it is humanly possible, share each other's heritages and receive the stimulus and guidance which we so sorely need in the study of the modern problems of Christianity and which is made possible only through the associated efforts of the ablest minds of Christendom. We are glad to observe that we have at least one body of associated Christian churches in America, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, which through its various agencies is making the most constructive contribution toward the problem of church union. Many plans designed to bring about this end have suffered sudden shipwreck in recent years, the most striking instance being the unofficial conversations of Canterbury and Rome of a few months ago. Convinced as we are that a greater degree of church unity is an absolute necessity if the church is to occupy her place of leadership in modern life, we realize also that this desired condition will not be brought about as the result of forced growth. It will be realized more slowly but more surely through the processes of history. Hothouse growth is never of a sturdy variety and hence the brief and ineffective life of many of our proposals of church union. One of these processes is the deeper knowledge and respect which Christians gain as the result of closer association with each other in practical Christian work. The other is the application of the scientific method to the study of the phenomena and literature of religion. So long as sound Biblical scholarship is not cultivated, chasms of misunderstanding

will separate Christian bodies, no matter how desirous and well meaning they may be to effect a closer fellowship.

We need not pause to point out how modern life has been enhanced by the application in a practical way of the discoveries of the physical and chemical laboratory. Space and time have almost been eliminated. Comforts are enjoyed by the masses of men which kings did not dream of a century ago. Supposedly incurable diseases which have plagued mankind for ages have been defeated through the application of the principles of bacteriology. Vast resources heretofore untapped, power unlimited and terrific, the scientist hints may soon be released by the splitting of the atom. What is more characteristic of modern life than this penetration into the closely guarded chambers of nature's secrets and bringing them forth into the light of day to be the servant of man. How impossible for religion to make the right approach to life unless it knows life as it has been endowed with these new potentialities. In many situations in life we cannot rightly understand our ethical obligations if we are distrustful or disdainful of the powers of the human mind. And yet in vast portions of the church this is the traditional attitude. There is, as Professor Erskine has stated in an article published in the *Hibbert Journal* of October, 1913, and which has been widely quoted during the past year: "the moral obligation to be intelligent."

But there is another side to the question and for us a more important and weighty one. Intelligence is not enough. It must be rightly directed by the highest concepts of morality. And a morality which is more than a philosophy of human responsibilities and duties and which is to be incorporated in living personalities as a sustaining and conquering power must have the ultimate sanction of religion. It must be found at the core of the universe. It must be traced back to the very heart of God. In Jesus Christ we have the revelation of the ultimate good. In His revelation of the nature of God and the infinite value of



human personality we have that which gives meaning and purpose to life. Do we not see the supreme need of modern life with all its material resources and scientific expertness, if it is to be saved from horrors and destruction, is to have a teacher in the things of the spirit? Let us not plume ourselves too greatly upon our mastery of matter. We are in greatest danger of being mastered by it. What though we travel in comfort and at terrific speed! Toward what are we moving? What of the great ends and goals of life? We can be rich at the circumference and poor at the center, as Eucken would say. Our western civilization is in greatest danger by reason of its materialistic achievements and the possession of the stupendous resources which modern science has placed in its hands. The laboratory which makes us acquainted with the X-ray may also discover the death ray. It has given us the merciful anæsthetic but it has also provided the fiendish gas and liquid fire of the department of chemical warfare, now a part of every modern army. The power of destroying life and property on a scale never dreamt of by the commanders in the late war is now confidently affirmed. Is this the acme of development, the logical outcome of what Ghandi calls the aggressive materialism and inborn lust of conquest of the western world? Is there no power of control and direction for ideal ends of these newly discovered powers or do they mark the beginning of the end of western civilization, as some thinkers suggest?

In a very suggestive article in the *Atlantic Monthly* (July, 1924) entitled "Physics and Civilization," the author reviews the contributions which this department of science has made to modern life and then concludes with this sentence: "We face the problems of the future with a new knowledge of the ultimate structure of matter, derived from radium, atomic spectra and the X-rays. What has gone before is mere earnest of the future. We may confidently depend on science to provide the foundation for a better social struc-

ture, if we can prevail upon ourselves to build thereon in a different frame of mind." How significant is this last proviso. What type of mind shall be found and who shall teach us concerning it? With new understanding in the face of our need, with renewed confidence in the face of the failure of all else that men have counted precious, let us say, "Let this mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus."

We have indicated that one of the other characteristics of modern life is the democratic movement. The revolutionary achievements in the intellectual world accomplished by the scientific method are paralleled by what the democratic spirit has done and will continue to do in the political and social spheres. So surprisingly swift has been the transformation of forms of government, since the Great War, that whereas a few years ago we were one of the youngest governments, to-day we are spoken of as the oldest government possessing a written constitution. Although in Italy and Russia there are sinister reactions against the democratic spirit and despotism in new forms is temporarily in the ascendency, we believe this attitude to be but a side eddy in the onward sweep of the democratic current which has so tremendously changed all human institutions. All the pressing problems of modern life, international relations abroad, social readjustments at home, our changing theories of education and art are involved in the democratic movement. The social sciences treat of the fundamental laws and principles by which men live together successfully and harmoniously. In the great task of social reconstruction for Christians who believe that the christianization of all the spheres of human activity is the ultimate objective of the Kingdom of God on earth, the coöperation of social science and religion is an absolute necessity. This was the message of Professor Rauschenbusch and this truth is the main thesis of Professor Elwood's recent publications. Good-will, kindness, brotherly affection, these tender Christian virtues which move men to work the works of love are not sufficient.

For instance much philanthropy in the past was ineffective, sometimes impoverishing to the recipient. Men meant to do well and gave to all who asked but they lacked the knowledge which modern scientific charity supplies and which enables the trained worker to help men to help themselves. What is the place of the church in this new phase of modern life? Let her receive with grateful hand all the light that social science can bring. It is not enough that we mean to do well, we must know how to do well. We must know more about the problems of poverty and vice, their causes and effects, if we are to wage successful war against them. We must know a great deal more about inter-racial and international relations than the newspapers ever tell us. We must know more about the conflicting ideals and aspirations of other nations. We must be able to see the point of view of other nations, and know, for instance, why all the South American countries fear us and why many of the European countries find it difficult to believe in the genuineness of our professed ideals.

But again the clear light of science is not enough. It illuminates the way; but more is required to make men walk therein. It indicates truly the solidarity of the race and that if one portion suffers, in some way all are harmed. It emphasizes the insufficiency of hatred and injustice as a foundation of a better social order. But even though men be thus intellectually convinced, it is necessary that "the emotion of the ideal," as Benjamin Kidd would say, that the consecrated will be present to make possible the doing of those things that we know. And here again the place of religion and the church as the custodian of religion is absolutely necessary. The social passion must have its foundation in faith. Faith that its ideals of righteousness are the expression of the will of God. Hope, so that, though the way be dark and the reverses many, we are sustained by the conviction that the processes of history are on our side. Faith which makes possible love, good will, which is the liv-

ing soul of social service, without which all the finished technique of the scientist is but sounding brass and clanging cymbal.

There is, we must realize, an influential school of sociologists who deny a place to religion in the forces which make for social progress. This is part and parcel of the economic theory of history, in its extreme form and the mechanistic view of the universe. Man is the product entirely of physical and chemical forces and the economic and cultural environment of his age. Acknowledging that these are potent forces, we deny that they are the most powerful ones. The creative power of the human will is able to break the chains of circumstance. There are powers inherent in human personality that are unlocked as we know ourselves as sons of God in Christ Jesus. How pale and ineffective is the type of mind that finds nothing but a series of mechanical causes and effects at work in the universe. We may discover its formula but we cannot break its power. Little wonder that the defeatist attitude, the position of aloofness from and cynical indifference to the struggle for the realization of man's highest ideals marks those who think of man as but a bit of cosmic dust. The truly powerful characters of history who vanquished age-old iniquities that plagued the human race were religious characters. The tenderness and compassion that makes possible sympathy with the unfortunate, the strength of faith that puts new powers in the heart of man for the conquest of old evils, are not these the specifically Christian characteristics of the social mind? Do we not find this type of mind in the greatest of the ancient and modern missionaries, in Tolstoy, in Lincoln, Lord Shaftesbury and Maud Adams? To lay deep and firm the religious foundation of the social mind is one of the pressing tasks to which the church is called if it is to minister successfully to modern life.

And let us think for a moment of one of the great means for the accomplishment of this task, which we all realize

has been too largely neglected, and ask ourselves the question, what is the place of the teaching function of the church in our modern life? What tremendous progress has been made by the public schools and the higher institutions of learning in our country in recent years! Over 20,000,000 children are enrolled in our elementary public schools, which are maintained by taxation at a cost, before the war, of \$30 for each pupil, 50 per cent. more than England's and nearly twice that of Germany for elementary education. Leading educators predict that within fifteen or twenty years every boy or girl will be receiving some form of high-school education. "The fact is," as Professor C. H. Judd declares, "that we are trying to give everybody in this country at public expense a higher education than he could get anywhere else in the world" (*The Teaching Work of the Church*, by The Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, p. 5). No less impressive than the above facts is the tendency of specialists in the theory of education to interpret the educational significance of the changed conditions of modern life, and to work out the functions of the school in view of these conditions. No one has done more significant work in this department than John Dewey. "For him, education faces toward the future rather than toward the past. It is the process whereby society reproduces its own life, perpetuates its own interests, and ideals, shapes its future, and ensures its progress. The end of education is not merely knowledge or power, but social efficiency, which includes, in a democratic society, the development of initiative, responsibility, and good-will." That the Christian Church must rebuild her teaching agencies if she is to occupy a place of influence side by side with the great educational systems of our time needs no argument. The Committee on Education of the Sunday School Council of Religious Education is responsible for the statement that probably 27,000,000 persons in America under

twenty-five years of age, belonging to what would normally be the Protestant group, are not in any Sunday School or in touch with any organized religious instruction. Small wonder that the report of the Army Chaplains on *Religion among American Men* stated that the great majority of young men, who have been nominally, at least, under the church's teaching, "have the most hazy and inadequate ideas about Christianity and its meaning for human life." . . . "The Church as a teacher has failed to instruct its own membership and to present its Gospel to the men outside its doors."

Welfare workers have borne the same testimony. Most remarkable was the open letter of judges of juvenile courts of New York City, representing the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths, in which they unitedly called upon their fellow citizens to see to it that the youth of our country received proper religious instruction. Without it, as they affirm from their long experience with the seamy side of life, there can be no hope for the development of individual morality or the sense of social obligation. Let the church bend herself to this task with renewed vigor. Let the proper sustentation of our religious schools be a part of every church budget. Let us see to it that our equipment, courses of study and teaching staffs are in keeping with the importance of the subject which we teach and do not suffer unduly when compared with the work of the public schools. There are many evidences that the church is reshaping her theories and methods of religious instruction. The newer courses in Teacher Training, embodying the viewpoints of modern educational psychology and Biblical scholarship, week-day religious education and the Daily Vacation Bible School, give promise of great usefulness. Let us not deride the efforts of some specialists in these subjects if their suggestions do not always work out well in practice. Some of the lessons for primary grades of the Department of the Religious Education of the University of Chicago were

considered to be absurd and without real religious content by my most capable teachers. Extreme examples may be found of course, but the whole movement must not be condemned because of them. On the other hand, these new facilities will be of greatest help to all who desire to see the church occupy her proper place as the teacher of youth.

To what extent shall the church minister to the recreational and social activities of her people? There is a great difference of opinion on this subject. I am convinced that the church needs to teach people the worthy use of leisure time. Wholesome Christian social contacts are of greatest value. The shy and forgotten people long for expressions of friendship and good will. By careful thought and planning of its entertainments and social affairs the church may exemplify the beauty of holiness and open new vistas to those who have been fed on the husks of the modern movie. A church gymnasium, especially in the case of city churches, not situated in the vicinity of a Y. M. C. A. or a Y. W. C. A., under trained leadership, may become a real means of grace. One of the crying needs of the church to-day is an order of trained helpers to the pastor that the church may adequately discharge her educational responsibilities and multiply her vital personal contacts, especially with youth. Thus the false view that Christianity is austere and forbidding is dispelled. Its mission to the whole round of life is recognized anew.

One thought more. With the increase of the cultural standards of our people, made possible by the opportunities for higher education, there is going hand in hand a finer appreciation of æsthetic values. Too long has a large portion of Protestantism been totally indifferent to the place which the beautiful and appropriate shall occupy in worship. We can learn much by studying the devotional literature of the ages and particularly the historic liturgies, and discerning the principles of worship which they disclose, readapt them in the light of modern knowledge and of modern



needs. Let us welcome the noblest forms of music and of art which may enrich the atmosphere of worship. Particularly in the building of our churches, let us use a little of the wisdom of this world and be willing to learn from those who know. The problems of ecclesiastical architecture are not mastered over night. How frequently generations of worshippers have suffered by reason of the misdirected efforts of the well-meaning but ignorant building committee that erected the church. If the state in its wisdom ordains that a competent commission on art and public buildings shall pass on all plans of this nature before they shall be accepted, is it too much to hope that some day we may have a church building commission which will be able to give expert assistance to the local congregation?

And, in a word, it devolves upon us, who are the leaders of the church, in our efforts to give the church her rightful place, to candidly study the nature of modern life as it appears in the light of science and as it is manifested in the manifold forms of its democratic aspirations. From modern life we will receive much, but to it we will bring far greater gifts, even the secret of the cross, the power of redemptive love, without which knowledge is vain, and the utopia of the social reformer is only the mirage of the desert.

READING, PA.

### III

## EVOLUTION AND PSEUDO-EVOLUTIONISM

A. S. ZERBE

### A. EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM DEFINED

The word evolution, ultimately from the Latin *evolutio*, and a legitimate coinage, means primarily to unroll or unfold. It implies something latent or preëxisting, which is unfolded. Neither nature nor man can unroll or unfold nothing. Gradually the term came to mean change, progress, growth, development, whether in nature or in human activity. We speak of the evolution of history, of a dramatic plot, and of growth from a germinal or latent, to a mature state, as the oak from the acorn. The word lends itself to varied and frequently to colorless, if not absurd, meanings. We read of the evolution of the steam-engine and of the automobile, the evolution of literature and civil government, of a nation and of religion, the evolution of a lady's bonnet and the evolution of the universe and so on indefinitely. It is a proof of the lack of discrimination and reflective thought that not merely the uneducated public, but supposedly educated ministers, lawyers, physicians, editors, and professors in academies, colleges, and theological seminaries could not give a clear definition of the words evolution and evolutionism if their life depended upon it. Back of the confusion of speech is a confusion of thought.

Magazine articles of a half hundred pages and even whole volumes descant eloquently on evolution without any intelligible attempt to define the scope and limits of the term. Truth and error are so skillfully (or shall we say carelessly?) blended that a half truth becomes a lie, leaving the reader in a confused state of mind on the whole subject. Wigand,

author of various scientific works, writes: "Evolution is an indefinite and confused movement of the mind of the age." Dr. W. Kidd declares: "It is the nebulous character of the doctrine of evolution that constitutes its strength." We distinguish between evolution as the process and evolutionism as the doctrine or philosophy of the process. We use the term evolutionism in contrast with creationism.<sup>1</sup>

The idea of evolution has undergone change, as the history of the movement shows; naturally different scientific definitions have been given from the earliest to the latest times. The tendency to ignore reasonable distinctions has actually led to assertions that a machine is a kind of evolution and evolution a machine; hence that the universe is a machine, a mechanism. Professor Crampton writes: "Whatever definition we may employ for a machine or an engine, we cannot exclude the living organism from its scope. . . . A living individual is a mechanism. . . . As far as the evidence goes it tells strongly and invariably in favor of the mechanistic interpretation" (*The Doctrine of Evolution*, pp. 14, 30). So, too, Professor Conklin: "Science reveals nature as a vast mechanism."<sup>2</sup> We discover, however, amid the bewilderment of scientific opinion and

<sup>1</sup> Though in theological literature the word creationism is employed to designate a theory of the origin of the soul as over against traducianism, it has lately come into use to denote the Biblical account of creation. According to Murray's New English Dictionary, "Creationism is the theory which attributes the origin of matter, the different species of plants, animals, etc., to special creation." "Creationism, the doctrine that matter and all things were created, substantially as they now exist, by the fiat of an omnipotent Creator, and not gradually evolved, or developed; opposed to evolutionism" (*Cent. Dictionary*).

<sup>2</sup> But another writes: "A machine is never alive in any legitimate use of this term. Motion is not necessarily life; it is only life that can produce motion. To speak of a mechanical organism is a flat contradiction in terms. In a machine the parts act and react only when in actual contact and in right relations. . . . A machine is not self-starting, self-propelling or self-sustaining. It wears out and needs constant care and attention with frequent repairs" (Prof. W. H. Wood, Dartmouth College, in *The Religion of Science*, p. 49).

terminology, a more or less steady trend in certain directions, until at present science has formulated certain laws as characterizing the evolutionary process. The dictionaries, encyclopedias, and voluminous literature offer many definitions; but they may be roughly grouped under three heads.

#### B. MEANINGS OF THE WORD EVOLUTION

We discover at least three fairly well-defined uses of the term.

##### 1. *Evolution as Denoting Change, Progress, Improvement*

A common, though not accurate or legitimate, use of the term is that denoting change, progress, improvement, in the arts, trades, and ordinary affairs of life. Thus, the improvement made in the mode of cutting grain, from the old-time "cradle" to the latest and most perfect "reaper," is frequently designated as an "evolution," but it is absurdly incorrect; the "reaper" is in no sense an unfolding or unrolling of an original something, but the result of ingenious devices. Or, take the printing-press and follow the changes from Gutenberg to the latest Hoe pattern. To call the various modifications an "evolution" is an outrageous abuse of language.

Contemporaneous literature abounds in similar stupidities. To be sure, there is no law forbidding a man to pollute "the well of English undefiled," but it all tends to support Talleyrand's contention that language, if not actually "invented to deceive," is, as employed to-day, admirably adapted to serve that purpose.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> The Duke of Argyll writes: "Development is nowhere more conspicuous than in human invention; the gun, the watch, the steam-engine, the aeroplane, etc. But this kind and conception of development has nothing whatever to do with the purely physical conception involved in the Darwinian theory. The idea of one suggestion arising out of another in the constructive mind of man is a kind of development absolutely different from the idea of one specific kind of organic structure being born by ordinary and physical generation of quite different parents without the directing agency of any mind at all" (*Organic Evolution Cross-Examined*, p. 75).

2. *Evolution'as Denoting a Growth, Unfolding or Development from a Germinal or Latent State*

Scientists speak of the evolution of the flower from the bud, of a moth from the cocoon and of the brain from primitive cerebral vesicles. A mathematician tells us of "the evolution of the sickening vapors emitted by foul oxide," and long before Darwin a theologian conceived of "the whole evolution of the ages from everlasting to everlasting as presentifically represented to God at once."

In biology the word denotes "the actual formation of a part or of the whole of an organism which previously existed only as a germ or rudiment"; also, ordinary natural growth, as of living creatures, from the germinal or embryonic to the adult or perfect state, as the evolution of the animal from the ovum. A common meaning of the word is that of descent or derivation, as the actual result of generation or procreation, as of offspring from parents. No one disputes such usage, and if no more were intended by the word, there could be no possible objection.

James Ward points out that the good old word "evolution" has been craftily diverted from its original connotations and made to represent an utterly indefensible philosophy and theology. He writes: "By evolution or development was meant originally the gradual unfolding of a living germ from its embryonic beginning to its final and mature form. This adult form, again, was not regarded as merely the end actually reached through the successive stages of growth, but as the end aimed at and attained through the presence of some archetypal idea, entelechy, or soul, shaping the plastic material and directing the process of growth. Evolution, in short, implied ideal ends controlling physical means; in a word was *teleological*. In this sense mechanical evolution or development becomes a contradiction in terms" [for the reason that in the current evolutionism the universe is a closed system controlled by natural law and admitting of no intervention, even by the Almighty].

It is important to observe that evolution in this sense differs from number *one* preceding in implying, not merely change and improvement, but an intrinsic aim and purpose, a varied and in fact almost limitless development of the homogeneous, but always of the homogeneous, and not as Herbert Spencer held of the development of the homogeneous into the heretogeneous. It matters not how many toes the primitive horse had, whether five or twenty, or what its size, it was always and is yet and from present indications always will be a horse, and not a dog or a cow. And so of the giraffe, how it acquired a long neck matters little; it was first and last a giraffe and not a bear or a lion, as it might have become, if there were such a thing as the homogeneous becoming the heterogeneous.<sup>4</sup>

If scientists meant no more by evolution than growth, progress, development from the lower to the higher in the history of the universe and of man, there would be little controversy at this point. In the first chapter of Genesis creation and development, creative periods and advance to higher planes and in fact progression from the simple to the more complex (*e.g.*, "let there be light," "let the earth put forth grass, etc.," "let the waters swarm, etc.," "let us make man, etc.") take place concurrently or consecutively; in short, the doctrine of advance, development, progression in the origination of the universe, of plant and animal life up to and including man, is set forth in the first of Genesis more clearly, logically, scientifically, and philosophically than in any other ancient cosmogony; and if the truth were told, than in any modern piece of writing, scientific or philosophic, of like brevity. Newton's *Principia*, Hum-

<sup>4</sup>"Evolution is not a power in itself, but only a suitable word to express the action of the Power that is constantly working in such varied forms in all nature. Strictly speaking the evolution is always the result of the action, or self-unfolding of this Power. . . . Evolution itself does nothing, it only stands as a term whereby the action of these two factors, latent capacity and environment, are expressed" (W. L. Walker, *Christian Theism and Ethical Monism*, p. 89).

boldt's *Cosmos*, Darwin's *Origin of Species* and other great works are outclassed, being elaborate treatises. Let those who write so gushingly on the transcendent merits of the current evolutionism try to match the first of Genesis.

Not only so, but the exegetes and theologians of the Christian Church of all ages emphasized progress, growth, development centuries before the advent of Charles Darwin and in fact accepted the doctrine of evolution in the legitimate sense (as held by Augustine and Newton), though they never made a fetish of evolution and worshipped it as a demi-god.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Following Lyman Abbott's *The Theology of an Evolutionist* of some twenty years ago, there have appeared scores of books and review articles repeating the charge that the Church teaches the doctrines of "an absentee God," "a transcendent God," "Creation by fiat," "special creation," "instantaneous creation" and so on. The truth, however, is that the idea of "an absentee God" arose with the Gnostics and was uniformly condemned by the Church of every age and clime. Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, Ursinus, the Wesleys, C. Hodge, H. B. Smith, E. V. Gerhart agree that God is everywhere present in the universe and so cannot be "an absentee God." Christian theologians have ever taught both the transcendence and the immanence of God though they may not always have succeeded in correctly formulating the profound mystery. If, however, the new views of the relation and character of time, space and an additional *quale* and of the fourth-dimensional geometry (whether that of Riemann-Holtzmann, Bergson, Einstein or Alexander) should prove scientifically and metaphysically tenable, or even probable, some of the old problems, while not solved, would at least be better understood. The position of the old authorities was that "in creating the universe God performed a transcendent act, in the sense that the act passed into another substance, since the universe is not of the same substance with him. In representing the act as transcendent they had no thought of putting God out of the universe; they were only guarding themselves from pantheism, which declares that God and the universe are of one and the same substance." Again, no deep thinker will try to make sport over "special creation," "instantaneous creation," "creation by fiat." Pray, what else than "special" or "instantaneous" can God's acts of creation be? Then as to "fiat," every school-boy ought to know that it is simply the Latin of Genesis 1:3, "*fiat lux*" and denotes a creative act responded to throughout the universe, but not necessarily uttered in audible, stentorian tones, as the objector stupidly supposes.



3. *Evolution as Denoting Continuity, Uniformity, an Absolute Creative Synthesis, a Change from the Homogeneous to the Heterogeneous by Means of Intrinsic Forces*

This third use of the term evolution is radically different from the two preceding and requires a more detailed scrutiny. The keynote, the essential idea of the current evolutionism, is continuity, intrinsic, eternal, absolute continuity, from first to last, from the primitive nebula to the plant, animal, man (and even God, in the pragmatic and pluralistic philosophies, nothing being static, everything in flux and flow). There is no real break in the series, for God is always learning and getting pointers from man and nature. According to the doctrine of continuity all takes place through the absolute supremacy of natural law, whether such laws (as in quasi-theistic systems) were ordained by God, or are in their nature eternal (as in pantheistic, materialistic, and atheistic systems). The thoroughgoing evolutionist is in a dilemma; if he allows that God created matter and force and ordained laws, he is consistently driven to allow that He may have created plant and animal life, and man; but such admission would negate his assumption and postulate of the invariability, universality, and continuity of natural law; and so, driven to the wall and liable to go into hysterics at the thought of supernatural intervention, he is tempted, logically enough and against his better nature, to question whether God created anything at all. He may, of course, especially when addressing a Christian audience, retain the word God, more as a mere figure-head than as the Creator and Upholder of the universe. His God is either the absolute of philosophy with no true personality, or the God of deism, who indeed created the universe but then abandoned it, or the "finite God" of Wells and the pluralists, a God who is powerless to control the complex affairs of the cosmos.

In short, the consistent evolutionist holds that there is no supernatural order at all, but only a dead level of natural law (not susceptible of modification or intervention even by Deity), a closed system, an absolute determinism, in the inanimate, the animate and the human spheres in all the stages of the "evolution" of the universe. That such is the real inner significance of the current evolutionism will appear from a detailed examination.

(1) *Evolution an Entirely Intrinsic and Naturalistic Process to the Exclusion of the Extrinsic and Supernatural*

Huxley, Cope, Buechner, Haeckel, Le Conte, Crampton, Conklin, Leuba, Merz, Burroughs, have stated boldly and in unmistakable terms what the evolutionism of to-day really is and is meant to be. Professor Huxley writes: "The hypothesis of evolution supposes that in all this vast progression there would be no breach of continuity, no point at which we could say, 'This is a natural process' and 'This is not a natural process.'"

Here, two points are to be considered: (1) "No breach of continuity"; (2) All "a natural process." These affirmations mean that the whole cosmic process, from the assumed nebula or star-dust up to an Aristotle or a Newton, is due to some latent force or energy, not directed by mind but by blind necessity. When Huxley affirms that all is "continuous" and "natural," he means that at no stage can the idea of God as intervening in the forces of nature or in human history be entertained. Not even the incarnation and resurrection of Christ are exceptional according to the evolutionistic formula. If such events actually occurred they come under natural law.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> It is of course true that Huxley, having in mind accredited phenomena, without any implication as to the ultimate cause, may not so far forth be charged with denying the existence and creative acts of God. But so far as can be discovered he nowhere, not even in the initial stages of the universe, leaves room for God and the super-

But since it was never known that by natural law any one arose from the grave, all such Biblical narratives are to be regarded as myths and legends. In short in the scientific scheme, God is either pantheistically identified with the universe, or deistically estranged.

Professor E. D. Cope writes: "The doctrine of evolution may be defined as the teaching which holds that creation has been and is accomplished by the agency of energies which are intrinsic in the evolving matter, and without the interference of agencies which are foreign to it. . . . *The science of evolution is the science of creation.*" Here, again, the idea is clearly expressed that creation is accomplished, not by a God outside of and apart from matter, but by "intrinsic agencies in matter," that, in fact, something creates itself. But this is contrary to all experience and is an absurdity.<sup>7</sup>

There is inexcusable confusion of terms in Cope's statement that plants and animals were "evolved from seeds, eggs and other germs." As seen above, under 2, the term evolution may be used instead of development to denote the growth of the oak from the acorn, but Cope teaches that such germ, seed, or life-principle, is itself an evolution from something that was not a seed or germ; this he calls a creation, that is, a thing creates itself, which Bergson calls "an empty and vain idea." Without pausing to inquire what Cope's conception of matter is, we note that in his view it must be eternal, for everything is "intrinsic," nothing "extrinsic."

Cope continues: "By whatever method species of plants and animals came into existence, they may be rightly said to natural. Though he does not say, "there is nothing supernatural," he adroitly says that we cannot say of anything that "it is not a natural process," which is practically a denial of the supernatural.

<sup>7</sup> Henri Bergson, the French philosophic wizard, writes: "To speak of things creating themselves would amount to saying that the understanding presents to itself more than it presents to itself—a self-contradictory affirmation, an empty and vain idea" (*L'Evolution Creatrice*).

be created. We speak of the existing plants and animals as having been created, although we know them to have been evolved from seeds, eggs, and other germs—and indeed from those excessively minute and simple structures known as cells."

Here all turns on the word "creation." Hitherto creation in the absolute sense, has been understood as meaning the calling into existence of that which before was not, or, as phrased in the Century Dictionary, "the act of producing both the material and the form of that which is made; production from nothing; specifically, the original formation of the universe by Deity." The word is employed, also, to denote a product of thought or fancy, or an artistic or mechanical invention, but these are relative, not absolute creations. Shakespeare speaks of "a false creation" and Disraeli of "creations of curious arts." Bergson says that all the so-called creations of man "are only creations of form. How could they be anything else?"

We are not surprised, therefore, that with such somersaults of reasoning, Cope should flatly declare: "*The science of evolution is the science of creation.*" Let us examine this astounding proposition. First, evolution is not a power, substance or entity at all; it is in fact a figure of speech, a metonymy, a use of one word for another. Evolution never did or made anything; evolution never made a gun or a sewing-machine; they were conceived and constructed by man. Evolution never created a grain of sand, a rose, a pig, or a man. They originated in mind, the Infinite Mind.

Since, however, as men advance in the use of language, plain, literal speech has a tendency to give way to figurative, one can see that people, scientists with the rest, not knowing definitely what is back of the forces of nature, come to regard this metaphor, this non-entity, as a veritable demi-god, with which one can conjure to his heart's content. It is such tricks of legerdemain with the word evolution that

cause endless confusion and misunderstanding regarding the whole subject.

Le Conte, a cosmic theist, neatly and cogently defines as follows: "Evolution is (1) continuous progressive change, (2) according to certain laws, (3) by means of resident forces. . . . The process (4) pervades the whole universe, and the doctrine covers alike every department of human thought." Every one sees that this idea of "certain laws," "resident forces," "pervading the whole universe," excludes inferentially all thought of a Creator prior to and above the cosmic process. But let us look somewhat closely at these several definitions.

a. "*Continuous Progressive Change.*"—The phrase "Continuous Progressive Change" is ambiguous. In the creation narrative, Genesis I, the "days" (periods) follow in natural, logical order and are "progressive" in the true sense, each preparing the way for the day succeeding, but not producing or "creating" it, as evolutionism teaches. Sequence and succession are clearly indicated, but only as the result of creative acts. If this were Le Conte's meaning there could be no possible objection. But the third statement "by means of resident forces" forbids any such interpretation. Le Conte's underlying idea is that the universe is the result, not of a divine creation, but of a becoming through intrinsic forces, the higher forms emerging from the lower.

Without entering here into the discussion, it may be observed that serious doubt has existed among scientists as to how far the word "continuous" fairly applies to the processes of evolution. While some hold that "variation" is indefinite, fortuitous and without any breaks, others meet such "assumptions" with a flat denial. If variation is not indefinite or fortuitous, it follows that it is not necessarily "continuous." Until scientists settle the question whether or not variation is "continuous," Le Conte's position must be regarded as problematical.

b. "By Means of Resident Forces.—Whether the "resident forces" originated with the Creator or are latent from eternity is the *crux* of the problem. The former view is theistic the latter either pantheistic or materialistic. The phrase must be interpreted consistently with other parts of the definition. If they imply a Creator as ordaining the "certain laws," the expression must be understood as consistent therewith. If Huxley's view that all is "a natural process," nothing supernatural, be accepted as the teaching of science, then God is ruled out at every stage of the process. Since scientists as a class do not accept the first chapter of Genesis, they are in desperation driven to hold that the universe has existed eternally, or that God created it in eternity, which is the old pantheistic identification of God, man and the universe. They therefore usually do not commit themselves under the pretext that science does not deal with "origins," though they are constantly "explaining" the origin of plants, animals, and man. It would seem, therefore, that science, if pressed, would be driven to hold that these "resident forces" were not created by Deity, but have been eternally present in the cosmos.

That the new or pseudo-evolutionism teaches that everything in the universe is the result of a natural, intrinsic, anti-supernaturalistic process is clear from other authorities. "We are bound, I think, carefully to distinguish these two views; the one (Laplace) regarding the universe, so far at least as we can know it, as a vast, automatic mechanism, and the other (Newton) regarding the laws of nature as but the instrument of nature's God" (James Ward, *Naturalism and Agnosticism*, I, 46). "That which we are confronted with at present is a naturalistic or scientific monism, in which one sole power works all things by a gradual evolution, and no distinction is made of man from nature or of God from the world" (W. L. Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 11). On the hypothesis that star-dust in the course of billions of years became mind and man, W. K. Clifford defined evolution as the tendency

of "the cosmic process to *personify itself*." Professor Clifford, the brilliant English scientist, had the candor to state the natural conclusion from the scientific premises.

(2) *Evolution as a Change from the Homogeneous to the Heterogeneous without the Intervention of God*

Herbert Spencer's famous definition, adopted from Von Baer, runs thus: "Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion; during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity; and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation." The only point that merits special consideration here is the affirmation that evolution is a change from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous. As Spencer does not recognize a God, but at most only an *Unknown*, the whole evolutionary process must in his view be carried on from first to last by natural law. What is involved in Spencer's view? As seen above, there is a true evolution of the homogeneous, as of the flower from the root and the varieties of the horse and other animals. "A vegetable seed evolves or develops into a root or stalk; but the root and stalk are still vegetable. They are still homogeneous with the seed. . . . If anything mineral or animal, anything heterogeneous, should appear in this evolution of the seed and the bud, this would prove that it was no evolution. But pseudo-evolution postulates what true evolution denies; namely, that homogeneous substance transmutes itself into heterogeneous. It asserts that a homogeneous mineral by intrinsic force, slowly, by infinitesimal degrees, converts itself into a heterogeneous vegetable. Evolution is thus not a change of *form* but of *matter*."

As we are here confining ourselves to what evolution is claimed to be and what it really is, without entering into a critique, we, remark merely that neither Spencer nor any one else has ever proved that the homogeneous transmutes itself into the heterogeneous. Delage and Goldsmith in



their great work on "*Theories of Evolution*" say: "The theory of evolution is closely allied with the theory of causality. . . . The law of the conservation of energy merely expresses the same truth in different words. . . . The theory of causality . . . eliminates from human speculations the supernatural or marvelous element, and compels man to seek explanations which admit of none but natural factors. It obliges him to create conceptions of the world which presuppose no miraculous act of creation, of creation from nothing. . . . One must reject *teleological* systems and consider causal explanations (natural) as the only satisfactory ones."<sup>8</sup>

### (3) *Evolution as a Creative Synthesis*

Confusion has arisen from the failure to distinguish between creation absolute and creation relative, or creative synthesis. It is widely held by scientists that just as man by utilizing matter and force can "create," so nature also "creates," creation and evolution according to Cope, being convertible terms ("the science of evolution is the science of creation"). But there lurks a fallacy here, as Bergson and others suggest. Ward in opposing mechanism and pluralism disposed once for all of the claim of creative synthesis in nature. "One thing is certain," he writes, "a

<sup>8</sup> The original runs thus: "Prise dans son sens le plus large, l'idée de l'évolution est intimement liée à celle de la causalité; rien ne peut se produire sans cause, rien ne peut disparaître sans laisser de traces; tout provient de ce qui précède et engendre ce qui suit. La loi de la conservation de l'énergie n'est qu'une façon différente d'exprimer la même vérité. La notion de causalité a une portée scientifique et philosophique immense, et cela tout d'abord parce qu'elle élimine de la pensée humaine toute idée de merveilleux et de surnaturel et l'habitude à chercher des explications dans les quelles seuls les phénomènes naturels interviennent. Elle l'oblige à créer des conceptions du monde ou aucun acte de création miraculeuse, de création aux dépens du néant, ne peut trouver place. . . . Elle l'oblige maintenant à repousser les explications si faciles suggérées par le point de vue téléologique, et à ne reconnaître pour satisfaisantes que les seules explications causales" (*Les Theories de l'Evolution*, p. 2).

strictly mechanical theory of the world, since it necessarily implies complete reversibility, can never explain what we understand by progress and development. . . . The so-called conservation of mass and energy might be regarded as symbolizing the initial state of the pluralistic world and as a symbolizing too the mere permanence and abstract being of its many units. But it is notorious that these concepts are the result of ignoring those differences of quality which alone convert units into individuals. Without these we may have *Erhaltung* but not *Entfaltung* as a German would say: "we may have conservation and indefinite composition but not development and definite organization."

Ward continues: "It will be granted that what synthesis creates in the practical world is not new entities but what we may call new values. Whatever be the ultimate meaning to be assigned to mass and energy, we may allow the bare conservation of this; in respect of it the new world would be only formative; there would be no new content. . . . It is doubtless a mistake to attempt to forecast the further course of evolution in detail; so far as synthesis is creative this must be impossible save within comparatively narrow limits" (*The Realm of Ends*, pp. 103, 109, 113).

#### 4. *Consensus of Opinion on the Real Import of Pseudo-Evolutionism*

Lest the foregoing characterization of the current pseudo-Evolutionism be challenged we add further proof from accredited sources. According to the Standard Dictionary, "Evolution is the cosmological theory that accounts for the universe and its contents by the combination of separate and diffused atoms existing originally in a condition of absolute homogeneity." This is simply the Spencerian idea of homogeneity passing into heterogeneity. But how such a transition takes place through mere natural law, neither Spencer nor any one else has ever explained or even offered an intelligible hypothesis.

Ernst Haeckel, the great German naturalist, accepting Darwinian evolutionism, considered himself justified in drawing the logical conclusion of crass materialism and atheism. He holds that the whole universe is a machine, in which the various parts are continually renewing themselves through endless cycles of time. He is careful not to state that this idea ignores the accepted laws of mechanics and physics, that a self-starting, self-continuing machine, or "perpetual motion," is an impossibility. Not content with limiting his conception to physical nature, he unblushingly holds that man is a mere automaton, has no free will and is determined in all his acts by ancestry and environment. His doctrine is known as *energetic monism*, the view that ultimately there is only one substance in the universe namely force or energy.<sup>9</sup>

The English psychologist, James Sully, co-author of the article "Evolution" in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, writes: "It is clear that the doctrine of evolution is directly antagonistic to that of creation. Just as the biological doctrine of the transmutation of species is opposed to that of special creations, so the idea of evolution as applied to the formation of the world as a whole is opposed to that of a direct creative volition. . . . It (evolution) substitutes the idea of a natural and necessary process for that of a volitional process," that is, mind, intelligence, personality, God are excluded in the doctrine of evolution as expounded by its champions.

<sup>9</sup> Distinction between monotheism and monism: according to monotheism, God is the only God, but not the only being; according to pantheism he is only being and the only substance and is identified with the universe and all in it. The term monism, from the Greek word denoting *one* has lately come into extensive use in a wide divergence of meanings. The *spiritual* or *ethical* monism of Strong and Walker is practically monotheistic. At the other extreme is *cosmic* or *energetic-monism*, which is practically atheistic.

C. IS THE CURRENT EVOLUTIONISM COMPATIBLE WITH  
CHRISTIAN THEISM?

1. *Do Scientists Believe in a God?*

A considerable number of scientists, recognizing a plan, law, design in the universe and in the earth, accept some form of theism. But it is difficult to determine whether they accept the Christian theism of the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches, or merely a personal idealism, as that of Eucken, the Cosmic theism of Sir Oliver Lodge, or the so-called Universal Spirit of Theosophy, false mysticism and of non-Christian cults in general. Reserving a detailed examination for a later section, we reproduce the substance of an investigation conducted by Professor James H. Leuba and contained in his *The Belief in God and Immortality*. He addressed a questionnaire to members of the American Psychological Association, The American Historical Association, The American Sociological Society and other learned bodies. As the number of members ranges from 3,000 to 8,000 he selected the last name on each page as reflecting a fair average.

On the question of belief in God he submitted three proposition, as follows: "1. I believe in a God in intellectual and affective communication with man. I mean a God to whom one may pray in the expectation of receiving an answer. By 'answer' I do not mean the subjective, psychological effect of prayer. 2. I do not believe in a God as defined above. 3. I am an agnostic." The questions were sent to 500 persons. College and university professors made up more than sixty per cent. of the total, while the men employed by the Government amount to twelve per cent. and in industries eleven per cent.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Under the head of belief in Immortality there are five questions as follows: "1. I believe in personal immortality for all men . . . conditional immortality, i. e., for those who have reached a certain state of development. 2. I believe in neither conditional nor in unconditional immortality of the person. 3. I am an agnostic. 4. Al-

Without recording the difference in views between Leuba's classification into "greater" and "lesser" men of science and omitting fractions, the ratio of scholars believing in the existence of God is: psychologists, 14 per cent.; biologists, 16; sociologists, 18; historians, 32; physical scientists, 35. From this it appears that a considerably larger proportion of historians and physical scientists believe in a God than biologists, sociologists, and psychologists. Leuba explains: "psychologists, sociologists, and biologists in very large numbers have come to recognize fixed orderliness in organic and psychic life and not merely in inorganic existence; while frequently physical scientists have recognized the presence of invariable law in the inorganic world only." If this distinction is correct, it indicates that psychologists, sociologists, and biologists accept the baldest mechanism and naturalism. Whether Leuba's conclusions are even approximately correct has been questioned. He has, however, supplied the most detailed statistics so far available.<sup>11</sup>

Whatever the ratio of scientists who accept the Biblical cosmogony and anthropology, it is clear that those who reject such a world view are by far in the majority and in though I can not believe in personal immortality, I desire it. 5. I do not desire personal immortality." The number of believers in immortality was, according to the answers, considerably larger than the number of believers in God.

<sup>11</sup> Leuba in a letter to the *Philadelphia Ledger*, Jan. 5, 1917, writes: "Not long ago some rash person affirmed in the English press that it is extremely doubtful whether any scientist or philosopher holds the doctrine of a personal God. Thereupon a Mr. Tabrum collected from among English scientists 140 expressions of opinion on this question: 'Is there any real conflict between the facts of science and the fundamentals of Christianity?' But the author did not define what he meant by the 'Fundamentals'; neither did he ask his correspondents to state the meaning they attached to that expression. Strange to say, very few thought it necessary to be explicit. Lord Rayleigh wrote: 'In my opinion true science and true religion neither are nor could be opposed.' . . . The significance of this statement depends altogether upon what is meant by 'true religion.' You may have in mind some conception of religion which would tolerate neither the Apostles' nor the Nicene creed, nor even a personal God."

possession of the field, dominating the scientific trend of the day and regarding with haughty contempt any one who is still so ignorant and unprogressive as to hold a Biblical and theistic view of the universe.

Leuba also made a study of the beliefs of college students with the following results: "The students' statistics show that young people enter college possessed of the beliefs still accepted perfunctorily, in the average home of the land, and that as their mental powers mature and their horizon widens, a large percentage of them abandon the cardinal Christian beliefs [obviously under the negative and sceptical influence of the teachers]. It seems probable that on leaving college from forty to fifty per cent. of the students with whom we are concerned deny or doubt the fundamental dogmas of the Christian religion." Leuba's conclusions indicate that science and evolution, as held and taught to-day, lead to a denial of the Christian doctrines of God and immortality.<sup>12</sup>

## 2. *The New (False) Evolutionism an Old Naturalism*

From the preceding review it is clear that whatever the word evolution formerly denoted, it has undergone a radical change of meaning. In its scientific sense it denotes that everything in the universe physical, mental and spiritual, has taken place according to natural law and through intrinsic forces. All other meanings are colorless in religious and theological discussion. The meanings listed under the above sub-heads *one* and *two* may or may not be exhaustive; it matters not in the ultimate issue. But this third viewpoint, *B*, 3 above, is radically false and misleading and subversive of the Christian theistic conception.

<sup>12</sup> Leuba questioned callow sophomores ("wise fools") whether there is a God and received such answers as might be expected. Some said, they saw no evidence of a God anywhere, everything being the result of natural law. A typical answer is the following: "I do not see that God has done me any good or has helped me in my work." *Der Apfel fällt nicht weit vom Stamm*. One is reminded of Socrates' biting sarcasm in one of Plato's Dialogues that in the degeneracy of the age mere striplings are called upon to solve profound questions of state and philosophy.

In the pre-Darwinian and early post-Darwinian periods the word evolution was still understood quite generally, though not without exception, in a sense that may be denominated theistic or at least deistic. Look at the proof. Sir Isaac Newton at the close of the *Principia* declares that "the whole diversity of natural things can have arisen from nothing but the ideas and the will of one necessarily existing being, who is always and everywhere, God Supreme, infinite, omnipotent, omniscient, absolutely perfect." A century later when Laplace submitted his *Mécanique Céleste* to Napoleon, the latter inquired why the word God did not once occur in the treatise. Laplace replied haughtily: "Sire, there is no need of him," implying that there is no God back of the nebulous mass assumed by Laplace. To Bentley's question regarding the origin of the solar system, Newton replied: "I answer that the motions which the planets now have could not spring from any natural cause alone, but were impressed by an intelligent agent."

The fundamental difference between the science of Newton's day and ours is the difference between the Newtonian and the Laplacean viewpoints, the one, theistic and supernaturalistic, the other, naturalistic, untheistic, and practically atheistic. In the pre-Darwinian period, scientists were expected to define their position on the question of a First and Absolute Cause, and not merely to dilate on the development of the physical universe, a start once having been made. "We have to note," says James Ward, "the existence in our time of a vast circle of empirical knowledge in the whole range of which the idea of a Necessary Being or a First Cause has no place. . . . If modern science were questioned as to this omission of all reference to a Creator, it would reply: "I am not aware of needing any such hypothesis" (*Naturalism and Agnosticism*, I, p. 5).

The irony of it all is that ministers of the Christian religion in their blindness are hoodwinked into the belief that one must accept without question all the assumptions and postulates of science.



### 3. Attitude of Kant and Darwin

The attitude of Immanuel Kant, the founder of modern philosophy, as also that of Charles Darwin, the originator of the current doctrine of evolution, on the question of Christian theism, are in dispute or at least equivocal. We mean Christian theism, and not any one of a dozen systems that are theistic only in name.

#### (1) Kant's Viewpoint

Since in Kant's system only empirical selves and sense objects can be known, a proof of God's existence is impossible (*Critique of Pure Reason*). Yet in the Third Critique (*Practical Reason*) Kant holds that the existence of God must be predicated in order that the highest good may be possible. "Freedom, Immortality, and God" he declares . . . "gain objective reality through an apodictic practical law, as necessary conditions of the possibility of that which the law commands shall be its object." He grants that there are supersensible objects, though nothing definite is known of them.<sup>13</sup> He nowhere positively states his acceptance of

<sup>13</sup> Contrary to popular belief, it was not Charles Darwin, nor even Laplace, but Kant who laid the foundation of the current, cosmic, atheistic evolutionism. Only a half-hearted theist at best, Kant in 1753 published a remarkably original paper on Universal Natural History and Theory of the Heavens (*Allgemeine Naturgeschichte und Theorie d. Himmels*), in which he not only suggested "the derivation of the present forms of ponderable matter from simpler and more universal material, but also laid the foundations of the modern nebular hypothesis (elaborated by Laplace) and even anticipated Darwin and Spencer in suggesting that the entire evolutionary process from nebular to man is a natural one." Kant's watchword, "Give me matter, and I will show you how a caterpillar can be produced," seems to be adopted by the whole guild of naturalistic scientists from Haeckel to the youngest and most up-to-the-minute teacher of science in our public schools and colleges. Kant, however, admitting difficulties and therein differing from present-day sciolists, granted that one can not know how the caterpillar originated without knowing how the universe originated. Possibly Kant, like Darwin, deemed it prudent discreetly to veil, rather than bluntly to avow, his real views in his major works.

the Christian theistic conceptions as formulated, *e.g.*, in the Ecumenical Creeds.<sup>14</sup>

(2) *Was Charles Darwin a Theist?*

In the *Origin of Species* (1859 and Am. Ed. 1920) Charles Darwin writes: "There is a grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one." If God created life-forms, he may inferentially be supposed to have created not merely the physical universe but also animal and human life as well. On page 274, Vol. I, of *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, by his son, we find: "In my most extreme fluctuations I have never been an atheist in the sense of denying the existence of God."

Per contra, in a letter to Asa Gray he writes: "I am inclined to look at everything as resulting from designed laws, with the details, whether good or bad, left to the working out of what we may call chance. Not that this at all satisfies me" (*op. cit.*, II, 105). Again, "I am conscious that I am in an utterly hopeless muddle. I cannot think that the world as we see it, is the result of chance, and yet, I cannot look upon each separate thing as the result of design" (II, 146). In another connection (II, 170) Darwin remarks that he could have no doubt of design if he could believe that there is a Designer distinct from the mechanical forces active in natural selection. This comes perilously near naturalism. When the Duke of Argyll in conversation with him referred to the wonderful contrivances in nature to effect certain results, Darwin remarked: "Well, that often comes over me

<sup>14</sup> "Kant was an ethical theist. . . . Incarnation in the Kantian sense was simply the personalization of the moral ideal, and the Church a society to help towards its realization. . . . His system may be described as a translation of Christian dogmatics into the terms of a moral rationalism" (A. M. Fairbairn, *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 206). In Kant's world view, according to J. A. Leighton, there is a Cosmic Thinker, a Creative Reason, who in thinking creates the objects of his thought, *etc.* (*The Field of Philosophy*, p. 200).

with overwhelming force; but at other times—(and he shook his head vaguely) it seems to go away" (*op. cit.*, I, 285). One recalls Carlyle's brusque comment: "I have known three generations of Darwins, *atheists all*."

The fact that Darwin with his usual candor and logical acumen could not reconcile the new views with the old theism indicates a parting of the ways. As one of the writers in *Fifty Years of Darwinism* remarks: "Darwin did not in explicit language deduce the legitimate inferences from his viewpoint, yet friends and foes alike at once drew what was the necessary corollary from the theory of natural selection."

#### 4. *The New Gospel of Science*

Whatever Darwin's cosmogony may have been, the bolder of his disciples (Huxley, Haeckel, E. D. Cope and probably the majority of American college professors) follow out consistently but often blindly the plain inferences of his evolutionism, an untheistic worldview. Not all evolutionists, even the most radical, would accept Haeckel's dictum, that God is "a gaseous vertebrate," even though such conclusion be legitimate on the assumed premises. If proof were needed that science is drifting in this direction it could be seen in Leuba's conclusions (as presented above) and in the voluminous literature of the subject, including articles in ponderous reviews, popular newspaper compilations and practically all the text-books used in high schools, colleges, and universities, which not only omit all reference to God as Creator, but by a subtle naturalistic line of thought convey the impression to immature minds that all takes place through natural law without a Law-giver back of it.<sup>15</sup> A Russian scientist writes: "Man like all living nature is an entirely material being. The mind is mere property of the body. Science has brought in a new gospel; its practical conclusion is simple—the old world must be destroyed, and we must begin with the two lies which have ground the

<sup>15</sup> See such books as Burrell's *The Evolution of the Earth and its Inhabitants* and *The A, B, C of Evolution*.

world into slavery—the first is God, the second duty.” Though we detest his doctrine, we have a higher regard for the Russian in his candid avowal than for college and university professors who are often wolves in sheep’s clothing. “In France many scientists and public men are avowed atheists. So, too, are most anarchists” (Micou, *Basic Ideas in Religion*).

The fallacy of any claim to disengage the facts of science from their ultimate significance is illustrated in Professor Royce’s treatment of psychology. He writes: “I try to tell him [the reader] a few things that seem to me important, regarding the most fundamental and general processes, laws and conditions of mental life. *I say nothing whatever about the philosophical problem of the relations of mind and body, and nothing about the true place of mind in the universe*” (*Outlines of Psychology*, p. vii). Who but a specialist cares about descriptions of sensation, habit, attention, and the usual grist in books on psychology? The serious reader, even the average school-boy, wants to know something about the *psyche*, the soul, the person, and will probably be most interested (as the writer can testify through fifty years of experience) in the very problems omitted by the author, and will want and ought to know the true place of mind in the practical affairs of life, if not in the universe. So, of other sciences, astronomy, physics, biology, and the rest, the average citizen wants to know not merely the What and How, but also the Whence and Wherefore.

The fundamental evolutionistic conception of the invariability and universality of natural law throughout the whole cosmos carries with it logically, in the view of the great body of evolutionists, the implication that any intervention from without, even for the realization of a higher end, is an impossibility; in short it negates the idea of a Supreme Being. The thoroughgoing theist believes also and even more strenuously and logically in the uniformity of natural law, but sees

in such law, only secondary causes, not an impersonal force latent in the universe from eternity to the exclusion of God, but the development of a plan, order, purpose, originating in a Supreme Personality.

(1) *Invariability of Natural Law*

The evidence shows that a large body of scientists, and not a few ministers and theological professors, entertain premises, which, if logically developed, land them on anti-theistic ground, despite their desire to cling to some form of Christian theism. The underlying principle of the only evolutionism that is in dispute is a crude naturalism. What is naturalism? It is that scientific and philosophical "view of the world, and especially of man and human history and society, which takes account only of natural (as distinguished from supernatural) elements and forces" (*Cent. Dic.*). Theologically, it is "the doctrine that all religious truth is derived from a study of nature without any supernatural revelation, and that all religious life is a natural development unaided by supernatural influence" (*ibid.*). Is the reader ready to allow that true religion is derived from the operation of purely natural forces to the exclusion of what Scripture says about the source of religious life?<sup>16</sup>

According to James Ward, naturalism designates the doctrine that "separates Nature from God, subordinates Spirit to Matter and sets up law as supreme; it means, to quote Huxley 'the extension of the province of what we

<sup>16</sup> According to naturalism "the world of phenomena, of things sensible, is the one and only reality. It claims that we know nothing beyond nature. God, therefore, is an illusive fancy or a synonym for the sum total of all mechanical forces. Thought is a mere product or accompaniment of certain forms of motion in nervous matter, from which it is inseparable. Psychology is a branch of physiology, and that is a form of mechanics. Man, therefore, is a helpless automaton" (*Micou, op. cit.*, p. 207). In true naturalism, "the supernatural is eliminated from nature so that all its phenomena may be traced back to simple, unequivocal and easily understood processes, and the conclusion is reached that everything happens 'by natural causes'" (*Micou, p. 210*).

call matter and causation and the concomitant banishment from all regions of human thought of what we call spirit and spontaneity . . . till the realm of matter and law is coëxtensive with knowledge, with feeling, with action" (*Nat. and Agnos.*, I, 186). Ward continues: "This naturalistic philosophy consists in the union of three fundamental theories: (1) the theory that nature is ultimately resolvable into a single vast mechanism; (2) the theory of evolution as the working of this mechanism; (3) the theory of psychophysical parallelism or conscious automatism, according to which theory mental phenomena accompany but never determine the movements and interactions of the material world."

As seen above the original and legitimate meaning of the word evolution implied mind controlling physical forces; in the current pseudo-evolutionism, the term evolution is indeed retained, or rather monopolized, with a new and wholly indefensible connotation, as denoting "the process by which the mass and energy of the universe have passed from some assumed primeval state to that distribution which they have at present. Also it is implied that the process will last till some ultimate distribution is reached, whereupon a counter process of dissolution will begin" (Ward, *op. cit.*, I, 187).

But can any theory of the universe, scientific, or otherwise start with an assumption contrary to our whole experience? Not, according to Herbert Spencer, who writes: "Be it a single object or a whole universe, any account which begins with it in a concrete form, or leaves off with it, in a concrete form, is incomplete." Let us apply this to the nebular hypothesis, which in one form or another is assumed by science. "A nebula presupposes colliding stars or meteoric swarms, whose material constituents are dissipated by the heat which their collision has produced; but these colliding masses in their turn imply still earlier *nebulæ*. So the cloud presupposes vapours that had previously condensed; and the vapour, cloud or water that had previously evaporated."

Though all this is arguing in a circle, the average scientist expects a gullible public to swallow it. May there not have been, as indeed an English astronomer suggests, an earlier or pre-nebular stage, during which, cold masses of primal matter (as taught in Genesis I) were moving through space in all directions (Vid. Croll in *Stellar Evolution*)?

(2) *The Old Evolutionism Predicated Mind*

A fundamental fallacy of naturalism and the current evolutionism is that "the material world is a self-contained whole, primary, fundamental, and independent of mind. Minds, then come to be looked upon as secondary and episodic; mere collateral products, that arise as often as matter falls into the appropriate organic condition; *psychoses* that are powerless to act upon their concomitant *neuroses*" Ward, *op. cit.*, II, 98). The consequences of this materialistic view will be pointed out later. But it is necessary to state the extremes to which the naturalistic view leads, as indicated in the viewpoint of Huxley, who boldly declares that if we must choose between matter and mind, "the materialistic terminology is in every way to be preferred. For it connects thought with other phenomena of the universe . . . whereas the alternative, or spiritualistic terminology is utterly barren, and leads to nothing but obscurity and confusion of ideas."

The exact reverse of this astounding statement is more in keeping with all that we know of matter and mind, for nowhere do we to-day see, nor has any age ever seen, that matter thinks, even in the most rudimentary forms. A generation ago we were told that materialism is dead, but here it crops out in a worse form than ever.

Again, if, as Laplace averred, there is no need of a God to account for the universe and its laws, there is in the current scientific movement no room for man or mind in the true sense, since everything is caused by "a fortuitous concourse of atoms," without aim, purpose or design, a propo-



sition so monstrously absurd that the dullest man in the world would protest. If the Huxleyan premises are valid, "if Darwinism be true, if Mind is to be driven out of the universe, and accident accepted as a sufficient cause for all the majesty and glory of physical nature, there is no crime or violence, however abominable in its circumstances and however cruel in its execution, which cannot be justified by success, and no triviality, no absurdity of Fashion, which deserves a censure" (*A gentleman with a Duster*, p. 21).

In short, "Either the universe is mechanical, or it is teleological; it is not likely to be a mixture of the two. But to justify naturalism, the mechanical theory must explain everything; what it does not explain must be unreal and illusory. Naturalism has for its base of operations the primacy of the physical series" (Ward, II, 63) and is perforce driven to substitute mere impersonal force for mind, spirit, spontaneity, freedom.

As naturalism has no place for God, personality, morality or immortality, it is practically atheistic and pessimistic.

### 5. *World Riddles*

In the ultimate analysis, the universe without the guidance of revelation is the profoundest of all mysteries. This was admitted by Ernst Haeckel, the German scientist, who popularized Darwinism in Germany and gave it an atheistic turn. In his book, *The Riddle of the Universe*, he teaches that "the whole universe is a machine, the various parts of which are continually being disintegrated and continually renewing themselves by an automatic principle of evolution through endless cycles of time." He denies that man has a higher nature of any kind; the mind of man is merely an emanation from his bodily structure. Man has therefore, no free will, he is an automaton, and all his acts are predetermined by his ancestry and his environment. As over against Haeckel's world riddle, writers have directed attention to some real riddles overlooked by Haeckel.

(1) *The Riddle of Matter and Force*

It has often been pointed out that scientists assume something in the very beginning of their investigations, and then quietly assume that such assumptions have been proved, a procedure palpably unscientific and illogical, if science deals with facts. We are not here referring to the use of hypotheses in investigation, which are of course allowable and indeed necessary, but to the assumption, *e.g.*, of matter, force, ether, etc., as if their existence were proved. Scientists do not start with the beginning of things, where all the difficulty lies. The first verse of Genesis declares: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." This is at least a clear and fundamental statement; whether it be true or not does not concern us here. It implies a creative Intelligence. Science without attempt at proof assumes the eternity of matter and force (impersonal).

A German scientist, Du Bois Reymond, in criticism of Haeckel, declared that there were at least seven world riddles, which the mechanical worldview and current evolutionism have failed to solve, but which are solved in the Christian system. These are: the existence of matter and force, the origin of motion, the appearance of design in nature, the beginning of life, the appearance of self-consciousness as intelligent thought, the origin of speech, and the freedom of the will. Reymond holds that scientists have no right to assume that these chasms have been bridged and then draw all kinds of unwarranted inferences.

We examine here briefly the first of these seven riddles, namely, the existence of matter and force, which all materialists from Democritus to Laplace, Haeckel, Buechner and the rest have been compelled to assume. Whence came this matter (which after all, according to the latest science, is a construction of mind)? It does not suffice to affirm that it is eternal, for that proposition may be challenged and so no progress is made. It may indeed be alleged that since matter is now in motion and no time is known when it was

not, it must be eternal, but this proves nothing. Whence this motion? If it be alleged that the cause of this motion is electricity, or gravitation or some other assumed immaterial entity, the question returns, whence such entity, material or immaterial? We still need to inquire What is the primal cause of it all? Helmholtz accepted the early dynamic theory of matter and of vortices. When asked, Who created the vortices, he replied "God."

The average scientist to-day, though not caring to commit himself, would, if pressed too closely, probably claim that matter and force are eternal, for he has the wit to see that if he allowed a God who created matter, he would be logically forced to allow that God might have created plants, animals, and man. If, however, the scientist, for one reason or another, should concede that God created something, a whole nestful of questions would arise as to what was created absolutely (for all such phrases as "creation by evolution" and "evolution is creation," etc., are unmeaning and at bottom contradictory) and what "evolved."

### (2) *The Riddle of Life*

The second problem that naturalism cannot solve is the origin of life. Science is baffled here more than in the case of matter and force. The current evolutionism affirms that in some manner not yet explained, the lifeless produced life, the inorganic the organic, the non-mental the mental, the non-spiritual the spiritual. Scientists of a certain type, with incomparable presumption and in defiance of all canons of thought, hoodwink the public into the illusion, that their initial assumption rests on a solid basis of fact. Until science has proved that biogenesis is false, it commits an unpardonable sin, not only against sound logic, but against science itself, which is supposed to be facts systematized, and not suppositions paraded as facts.

The attitude, however, of the more sober-minded scientists may be indicated by a few citations. Thus P. G. Mitchell

writes in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*: "No biological generalization rests on a wider series of observations, or has been subjected to a more critical scrutiny, than that every living organism has come into existence from a living portion or portions of a preëxisting organism." We reproduce the following deliverance of Lord Kelvin: "Was there anything so absurd as to believe that a number of atoms falling together of their own accord, could make a sprig of moss, a microbe, or a living animal. . . . It is utterly absurd." Nevertheless in spite of the absurdity thousands of professors of science are strutting through the land or within the confines of their pent-up Uticas are proclaiming that all comes from force and that any one who shares Lord Kelvin's views is a fit subject for an insane asylum. Kelvin proceeds: "Here scientific thought is compelled to accept the idea of creative power. Forty years ago I asked Leibig . . . if he believed that the grass and flowers, which we say around us, grew my mere mechanical force. He answered, 'No more than I could believe that a book of botany describing them could grow by mere chemical force.'"

A year later, Kelvin in addressing medical students in London said: "Let them not imagine that any hocus-pocus of electricity or viscous fluids would make a living cell. . . . Nothing approaching to a cell of living creature has ever yet been made. . . . No artificial process whatever could make living matter out of dead;" In fact so far as science has thrown any light on the inner nature of matter, force, life, mind, spirit, we know little more than seventy-five years ago.

For proof of this statement we cite from an article in the *New York Times*, April 16, 1924, written by P. W. Wilson and reproducing an interview with Ex-President C. W. Eliot, of Harvard, on the occasion of his reaching the age of ninety years. "I asked him, as a distinguished student of physical science, whether he could mention any new addition during his lifetime to our knowledge of the real nature of

matter. By the question I intended to imply an inquiry not into the way matter behaves, *but what it actually is*. Did we know anything now that was not known ninety years ago? 'Nothing' was the laconic and indeed whimsical answer, 'so far as my reading goes.'<sup>17</sup>

The interview contains another remarkable statement. "It is a fixed axiom in Dr. Eliot's analysis of his own character and career that he has never had an original idea in his head. As a concession to the incredulous caller, he will admit that sometimes, on the spur of the moment, he has said something which may sound fresh and inspiring. But in the main, his philosophy is—according to his own account—wholly derived from others and especially from books. This in his unassuming estimate of the position." In the light of the unassuming modesty of this distinguished scholar and scientist, let the "original thinkers" of all shades who boast that recent discoveries necessitate a reconstruction of theology from the ground up, put all this into their pipes and smoke it.

Have any discoveries been made since Kelvin's day which

<sup>17</sup> Eliot's strong statement possibly needs some qualification. We are permitted to quote from a private letter of Prof. Hale Charch, Ph.D., of the Chemical Department, Ohio State University, a paragraph throwing light on the subject. "Up to the discovery of radio-activity about twenty-five years ago, the atom was considered the ultimate and indivisible part of matter, and since there were about 80 odd elements known, scientists supposed that that there was a corresponding number of atomic species out of which the universe was constructed. . . . The following views, however, are far beyond the controversial state with scientific men, and are *facts* known with the same degree of certainty that we know our whole body of scientific knowledge. Instead of some eighty different ultimate species, we now have *two*, namely the *electron* and the *proton*. The former is the ultimate charge of negative electricity and the latter of positive electricity. The former has a mass about one-eighteen hundred and fortieth (1840th) of that of the latter. Their magnitude and many other physical properties are known with a high degree of precision. Out of these two units, all matter is constructed. The 80 [others say 90 or 125] elements are *spacial* configurations of protons and electrons, differing from one another in the *number* and *arrangement* of the positive and negative charges." Such is the current electrical theory of matter. Whether it favors creationism or evolutionism remains to be seen.

in any way disprove his clear-sighted view of the situation? We are, of course, from time to time regaled with newspaper reports that Professor so and so of such and such a university, has at last succeeded in producing life from the non-living. Just as we write, *The Scientific Monthly* (Lancaster, Pa.), has an article on this subject, in which along with other hypotheses, it is claimed that "the first living thing was an isolated cell in the primeval ocean. Somehow or other [yes, somehow, the usual scientific camouflage] it grew a tail that enabled it to rise to the surface [there you have it] and then the sunlight gave it power to make its own food out of the air and water." We are told that this guess work is in accordance with our latest knowledge.

The editor of the *Monthly* writes: "This is far from knowing what did happen in those early days, but it is a great advance to be able even to speculate as to how it might have happened, since not many years ago it seemed that it could not happen at all." Where has that editor lived that he seems never to have heard of the Greek Ionic philosophers and that "speculation" on this subject has been going on thousands of years and always ends in speculation and guess-work. Sporadic cases of getting the truly living from the non-living are reported from time to time, but they share the fate of Henry Ford's Cows' Milk.

Henry Ford, according to the *New York Tribune*, said: "It is a simple matter to take the grains the cow eats and make them into milk superior to the natural article. The cow is the crudest machine in the world. . . . Our laboratories have already demonstrated that cow's milk can be done away with." The trouble, however, with the artificial milk is that it is injurious to babies, just as artificial honey is injurious to bees. Ford's idle boast is on a par with that of a veterinarian in New Jersey, who affirmed that he "could make a better cow than God ever made." Up to date the manufactured cow has not been placed on the market.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> "Science can assemble every element known to exist in the

Professor Haldane writes: "The physical and chemical conception of the world breaks down absolutely and hopelessly in connection with the phenomena of life, however useful it actually is in connection with inorganic phenomena. It is therefore, nothing but a working hypothesis of limited useful application" (*Mechanism, Life, and Personality*). We are sometimes told that if only time be allowed, the non-living could become the living. But this expedient, known in logic as the "fallacy of the imperceptible," mistakes quantity for quality. The difference between the inorganic and the organic is not a question of time or quantity, but of quality or essence. In the language of Professor Carl Hauptmann: "The most primitive life, from which along the living world on this earth can have sprung, can only be assumed to be a species, the members of which varied in manifold ways and propagated themselves. Here we have to do already with an eminently complex interaction of elementary processes. . . . The origin of the simplest living substance is mechanically quite unknown and uncomprehended." Stronger still is the language of Oscar Hertwig: "It may be broadly said, that in spite of all progress of science, the chasm between the living and lifeless nature, instead of gradually closing up, has, on the contrary, become deeper and deeper."

A favorite position of the new evolutionists is that life has a physical basis and that in some way unorganized matter produces life. But the simplest form of life known to us is the cell, and this is really organized matter. Of this Professor Wilson writes: "The study of the cell has on the whole seemed to widen rather than to narrow the enormous gap that separates even the lowest forms of life from the inorganic world" (*The Cell, etc.*).

grain of wheat—proteins, nucleo-proteins, phosphotides, carbohydrates, fats, phosphorus, iodine, chlorine, and fluorine, salts of iodine, iron, potassium, calcium, manganese, sodium, silicon including the extraordinary substances known as vitamins, but science can't make the combination sprout in the ground" (A. W. McCann, *God or Gorilla*, p. 99).



### (3) *The Riddle of Personality and Self-Consciousness*

Another riddle that science has not solved is the origin of human personality and self-consciousness. The inquiry of necessity takes such a wide range that only a few outstanding facts can be mentioned here. First of all, it is often stated that mental action in animals and man is a function of the brain. But the change from matter to mind is as the case now stands, unthinkable. The eminent physicist, DuBois-Reymond writes: "Motion, whether in the brain or elsewhere, can only produce motion, or transform itself into potential energy. Potential energy can only produce motion, maintain statical equilibrium, push, or pull. The sum-total of energy remains constantly the same. More or less than is determined by this law cannot happen in the material universe; the material cause expends itself entirely in mechanical operations. Thus the intellectual occurrences which accompany the material occurrences in the brain are without an adequate cause as contemplated by our understanding. They stand outside the law of causality, and therefore are as incomprehensible as a *mobile perpetuum* would be." Professor Fiske is equally explicit.<sup>19</sup>

Self-consciousness is the dividing line between human and animal life and constitutes a gap or break as impassable as the passage from matter to mind. Self-observation on consciousness reveals three facts of prime significance: a multitude of ideas or concepts which come and go, the ever-changing unity of the same and the union or unification, of the successive states of consciousness by the static or unchangeable Ego, self, or I. We distinguish between the essence or inner quality of a thing and the states of the same.

<sup>19</sup> He writes "That it [self-consciousness] can not possibly be the product of any cunning arrangement of material particles is demonstrated beyond peradventure by what we know of the correlation of physical forces. The Platonic view of the soul, as a spiritual substance, an effluence from the Godhead, which under certain circumstances becomes incarnated in perishable forms of matter, is doubtless the view most consonant with the present state of knowledge" (*Man's Destiny*, p. 42).

The essence of the oak-tree abides; it is in the acorn, but the form changes. So of the ego, self, the soul, we distinguish between the metaphysical self, which is the same from childhood to old age, and the empirical self which changes constantly. The contention of materialists, pragmatists, and behavioristic psychologists that the soul is not an abiding entity, but merely a series of stages of consciousness is false psychologically, metaphysically, and legally. Years ago Robert Ingersoll, defending a man who had committed a crime twenty years previously, argued that the fellow had changed so much that he was really not the same person and so could not be held. The judge ruled that in law and in safe psychology, the ego, self, person is fundamentally (though not experientially) ever the same.

Since the animal has the power of sensation, perception and recollection (not true memory), the conclusion is often drawn that it has reason, but nothing could be wider from the mark. Wuttke in his *Christian Ethics* remarks that while reason has the animal, man alone of earthly beings has reason, that is, conscious rationality. A dog coming into my library sees the various objects as sense-perceptions, very much as a man, but it cannot unify such sensations and hold them together in consciousness; in short cannot *begreifen* (*concipio*;) them, or form concepts. It sees merely isolated units and can never get beyond them, whereas a small child, remembering and combining such units, that is holding them together in consciousness, is able to enumerate, compare, collate the data and draw inferences, in short, can reason, at least in a simple way—a thing which the most highly trained dog, or even the trained horse, "Clever Hans" of the German psychologist, is unable to do. Clever Hans could, as the result of innumerable sensory impressions, perform wonderful tricks, but he could never initiate a new movement or originate an idea. If by any chance the series of acts was broken or interfered with, all was confusion and the poor creature was hopelessly

"rattled" and "broken up." It was always necessary to start the mechanical process anew.

Throughout all the centuries of recorded history, it has never been known that an animal, whether, dog, horse, ape, chimpanzee or gorilla transcended its natural state and became a self-conscious, reasoning person.

In its inability to account for the riddle of personality (that is, "riddle" for evolution, not for divine creation), the current evolutionism, conceived as a wholly intrinsic process and a transition from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, breaks down utterly and absolutely. To be sure, the latest champions of evolutionism, recognizing the futility of holding that man sprang from the lower orders, now claim that the direct ancestor of man was not an ape or gorilla, but a semi-ape, an intervening link between the ape and man. But this is an inference from a hypothetical sequence of skeletal remains and so lacks absolute scientific certitude.

DAYTON, OHIO.

#### IV

### IS JESUS STILL THE WORLD'S SAVIOUR?

FREDERICK K. STAMM

"Again and again," said Tyrrell, "I have been tempted to give up the struggle, but always the figure of that strange man hanging on his cross sends me back to my task again." I should be glad to bring this paper to a close right here with that quotation, if, in some manner or other the Saviourhood of Jesus could now be looked upon as a constant suggestion of a morally inexhaustible reservoir of spiritual energy upon which he who will may draw in his time of need. Out of weakness we become, in the comradeship of Jesus, strong in ourselves. And that, in the final analysis, the New Testament seems to say, is what Jesus desired of us.

It is a perversion of Christian thought to start with a rigid premise as to the nature of God, and force Jesus into some hard category of divinity. "Christian thought begins," says Sperry, "with the benevolences of common life which no minor pessimism can deny."

"The charities that soothe, and heal, and bless,  
Are scattered at the feet of Man-like flowers.  
The generous inclination, the just rule,  
Kind wishes and good actions, and pure thoughts—  
No mystery is here! Here is no boon  
For high nor yet for low; for proudly graced—  
Yet not for meek of heart. The smoke ascends  
To heaven as lightly from the cottage hearth  
As from the haughtiest palace. He whose soul  
Ponders this true equality, may walk  
The fields of earth with gratitude and hope."

"He comes to us," says Albert Schweitzer, "as one unknown without a name, as of old, by the lake-side, he came

to those who knew him not. He speaks to us the same word, 'Follow thou me!' and sets us to the tasks which he has to fulfill for our time. He commands. And to those who obey him, whether they be wise or simple, he will reveal himself in the toils, the conflicts, the sufferings which they shall pass through in his fellowship, and as an ineffable mystery, they shall learn in their own experience who he is."

The greatest spiritual fact that has ever emerged in the long history of the human race is Jesus of Nazareth's conception of God. Is the matter of how Jesus came into the possession of this God consciousness too old and trite for another consideration? I hesitate to enter upon this old path, lest it lead both you and me into a bog of mere technicalities which solves nothing and but leaves our souls feeding upon mere husks. But I *must*. We are trying to make a re-discovery of the Saviourhood of Jesus, and if, in any sense that can be adequately done without resorting to metaphysical lines of reasoning, then the only thing we can do is to find a reason for preaching and teaching that Saviourhood on a perfectly rational basis.

Our interest is not in the Virgin Birth, but in the awakening of the soul to the presence of God. If we can get Jesus away from the false glamor of authority, out of stained-glass windows, out of our ecclesiastical tights—yes, in fact, if we can get him out of doors, out into the open fields, into the streets, where his influence will be unconnected with artificial masks, if we can look upon him as a real person, with a soul like ours, and listen to his words, not as spoke by an angel, but by a man whose chief interest lay in finding truth, I am quite sure his personality will have a better chance to operate.

Let your imagination roam a little. Without unduly dealing with the details of those silent years, let us sketch the normal growth of this lad of Nazareth. In *My Lady of the Chimney Corner*, by Alexander Irvine, we see a son meeting his mother in the closing years of her life, and in

their serious and intimate talk he inquires about her hope, her outlook, her religion. "The biggest hope I've ever had," she said, "was to bear a child that would love everybody as yer father loved me." Mary of Nazareth dreamed an even loftier dream than that. It was her hope to bear a child who would love men as God loved her. In the hour when this child put his elbows on his mother's knees, and looked up into her face, he must have caught her hope, and felt as if he had stepped into the inmost circle of the radiant love of God and as he looked into her eyes he must have felt himself looking into the eyes of God.

We follow this lad to the school-room where the chief lessons he learned were from the Law and the Prophets. We see his face light up as he learns the history of his race and catches his nation's sense of the possession of the One God. He heard the voices of the prophets as they burnt and glowed with the promise that had still to be fulfilled. He understood the meaning of the muttered hope, whispered on the crowded streets of the down-trodden race: "Someone is coming! A Deliverer is coming! Would God that he might come!" How these great prophecies must have spoken to him, waking a responsive thrill in his soul.

Perhaps we make too little of the father of Jesus in moulding the mind of the growing boy. Nobly Joseph must have filled the rôle of father in that home. Out of that companionship of father and son, must have been born Jesus' idea of God as Father. The great prayer of Christendom, "Our Father Who art in heaven," laden with the eternal spirit of a human home, must have been born out of the fragrant memories of that Nazareth household.

We have been wont to marvel at the selfless love which was characteristic of his later years. But why marvel, when this must have been one of the earliest flowers to bloom in the heart of the Nazareth boy? Great souls are not suddenly made. Jesus calling men to the humbleness

of little children could never have been, had the unspoiled freshness and wonder of a child's heart not have drawn him long before he reached mature years. When he saw his companions growing up with this humility fading out and lost behind the "world's offending dust," he felt an emotion akin to that of bereavement, and there came to him a yearning desire to do something, if only he could find a way to recover that lost possession. This was to become the all-dominating passion of his life in later years. "And in the awakening soul of the boy it must have added a passionate note to his longing and waiting for God."

How many sermons and books have been written on the crowning point of this early experience—the moving incident of the twelve-year old boy in the temple! Who can doubt that here the first great hour of spiritual crisis struck in his career? "The great word," says J. A. Robertson, "is spoken at last out of the heart of Time into the listening Soul of the Eternal—"My Father." It was the Word for which God had waited ever since the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy.

Yonder he lingers in the temple while the parents go a day's journey. And while the little company were pitching their tents beyond Bethel, we seem to see the young boy finding his way to the now deserted camping-ground outside the city walls. As he lay down, a mere lad, alone beneath some lordly cedar, and wrapped about with the hush of night, watched the glistening stars in the deep blue over Kidron's vale, suddenly the presence of the Divine which visited him in the temple, broke now into vision, and he heard the voice, "Thou art My Beloved Son," as clearly as he heard it later by the banks of the Jordan.

In this holy hour some Divine consciousness of a divine vocation must have stirred his soul. There must have come to him the feeling, at least, that he had a work to do in the world—some amends to make "for the long dearth of human love to God"—that he was commissioned to make a



fresh offer, an offer from God longing for the end of the great estrangement between Him and mankind.

Eighteen years later he hears of a preacher at the River Jordan. The theme of that preacher is, "Repent, for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand." The hour had struck. He must enlist in that cause. He lays aside his carpenter's tools, tells his mother of the voice, and sets off toward the Jordan. What a thrilling scene that is—this sun-burnt carpenter, his muscles standing out like whip-cords, in his eye the gleam of a crusader, bowing before the lean and ascetic John, receiving his blessing and benediction. There he knew that that which possessed him and impelled him in prayer was itself an "upsurge of the spirit of God within his soul!" He might have prayed as once St. Patrick did long after, "Behold in me Thyself at prayer." . . . "Behold in me Thine own will lifting itself in a mighty yearning that needs must break into action, to answer the cry of Thy love in the emptiness of man!" One holy purpose shook his soul. Every dream of every prophet stood before his vision. One by one he saw the great world-empires rise and fall. One by one he saw them sink into oblivion, to be finally supplanted by the vision of the Son of Man, the noble dream of a coming Kingdom of Humanity, whose power was to be no more brute force born of the earth-spirit, but obtained direct from God. This was the great ideal that seized and shook and moulded the Nazareth Dreamer's soul, "the ideal of a Human-Divine Brotherhood emerging over against the misery and restlessness of estrangement from God, the tangle and discord of his day."

Was it a vain dream? Why, in one form or another it has been the dream of all the great ones of earth. It is the ultimate goal which God is seeking through the evolutionary process of human history. All the loftiest dreams of the great torch-bearers of history, from Plato to Kant and to our own day, all the noblest visions of the greatest poets

answer with impressive unanimity. It is the ideal "Republic," the "Kingdom of Humanity," the "Paradiso," the "Utopia," the "New Atlantis," the "Federation of the World." It is the "City of God." It is the "Kingdom of Heaven." The purest form of all these was the vision of the noblest dreamer, the holiest prophet-reformer of them all—Jesus.

But to dream is one thing, to carry it out while all the time you are being called a fool, is another thing. And this is just the temptation that he faced. "Why be a fool? You can be a great man if you want to be without bringing down upon your head the criticism of your fellow citizens. What is the use of taking the road to Calvary when you can go round it? Give the people bread. Show them miracles. That is what they want. But if that does not quite suit you, tickle them by coming in the manner in which they are expecting the Messiah. Step down before their eyes, as it were, from heaven. They are looking for that kind of thing." And when Jesus shook his head at all this, once more some voice spoke to him. "Now look here. Don't throw your life away. Men are not worth it. And besides they do not want what you are proposing. Lower your terms. Play up to the officials just a little bit. You can have what you want. Don't waste your time by fooling around with a lot of ideals. They do not work in practical affairs." And Jesus shook his head again. He had no proof that he was right except his consciousness of God, and his knowledge that he and the devil lived in two different worlds.

To a man who is here to be the doer and achiever of something that is eternally significant, what matters it if he be called a fool? We talk of him as a great teacher, a teacher of charm and insight, or a great example of idealism "who saw life steadily and saw it whole." He lived, some hold, the well-rounded, rhythmic, poised life. "No," says Golver, "that was Sophocles." Here is a greater.

He penetrates far deeper into things. He knows human nature, he knows the wrong that lies there, and the thing he means to do is to rid men of wrong and bring them back to God. It is not only a martyr's death toward which he is advancing. His step has in it a deep purpose. "I have a baptism to be baptized with," he says. "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save the lost."

This brings us to the two great facts that must form the theme of this discourse: Sin and the Saviour from Sin.

### I. SIN

"Our crimes," says Emerson, "may be lively stones out of which we shall construct the temple of the true God." He taught that man's short-coming is not sin, but only a necessary stage in the normal development of a man. It is the "green apple theory" of moral evil. Sin is a green apple, which needs only time and sunshine and growth to bring it to ripeness and beauty and usefulness. But in the language of Dr. L. P. Jacks, "I refuse to recognize as God any being with whose goodness the existence of evil can be reconciled."

I do not care by what name you call it—sin, evil, wrongdoing, missing the mark, or what not—this much I know, that when a man gives himself over to an earnest study of God's ways in human affairs, and of God's laws and their working, the great contrasts in men's responses to God's rule become luminous. This contrast and this deflection from the will of God, I am pleased to call by no other name than sin. This is the shortest word, and carries with it as much meaning as any other. We can not get away from the fact that man matters to God. And if God really matters to a man, all life will show the result. Good and bad, right and wrong, stand out as clear as the contrast between light and darkness—they cannot be mistaken, and they matter—and matter forever.

I know of two ways whereby I can be made certain of

sin. First, when I study myself. What is the use of inventing a theory of sin, when we find it in human life? It is an easy thing, too, to bring a charge of sin against humanity in general. "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God," says nothing. At least not enough to get under the skin of any one sinner and make him cry for forgiveness. Present-day fiction is full of the same confession, and make a defense of it by saying that it is only depicting life. Everyone of our congregations will acknowledge sin in general, and not turn a feather. It means just as much and just as little as our syllogism in logic, "All men are mortal," which we all admit as a major premise, but which never makes us realize that we must die. I know sin when I know it about myself.

My own experience says three things to me. First, I have seen the better and done the worse. I know this, not generally, but particularly and concretely. I take this ugly, besetting sin of mine, which I have time and again dragged out into the sunlight and hewed to pieces, only to see it come to life again and dog my way. I am not now speaking of the notoriously wicked things, but just those petty things which I do not blush to yield to daily, but which gives me shame every time I look them squarely in the face. (I'll come to a definition of sin a little later.)

The second thing that my experience tells me is, that I have not only done evil, but I have liked it. I knew the warning against it, the appeal to everything worthy in me, but I did it. Ah, how I liked it!

What's done we partly may compute,  
But know not what's resisted,"

says Burns. It is true. But the plea cuts both ways. I know "what's resisted." I also know the ideals of God that I resisted in doing the sin.

But there is a third thing that my sin says to me. Thomas Carlyle in Mrs. Austen's drawing-room, with "Sydney Smith guffawing," and "other people prating, jar-

goning, to me through these thin cobwebs Death and Eternity sate glaring." "How will this look in the Universe?" he asks, "and before the Creator of man?" Yes,

"But what will God say?"

asks Browning in the *Worst of It*. What will He say? God can not regard us other than we are. When I sin my mind is clouded with a dark apprehension lest I should really find Him and He find me. My cry of "My soul is athirst for the living God; when shall I appear before the presence of God?" becomes the other cry of "Whither shall I flee before Thy presence?" I dislike the thought of God. I want to forget Him and everything that reminds me of Him. "Thus conscience doth make cowards of us all."

I know sin because of a second thing. I see it about me, and when I see it, if I have any sense of right and wrong, I want to smash it. Here again Dr. Jacks comes to our rescue in getting us out into the light on the problem of sin. There stands the villainy of Iago. I've got to take a definite attitude of opposition against it. I cannot call it good. I must call it evil. And when I call it evil I mean that that kind of thing I am out against. If I am not out against it, what is the sense of calling it villainy? There is the treachery of Judas, and the sufferings of the Great War, and the attendant evils of a pagan social order. Think of the treachery of Judas as a crime which thirty million pieces of silver would not induce you to repeat against your fellow-men. Think of the sufferings of the Great War as something which must never occur again, and the repetition of which you, so far as in you lies, mean to prevent. Think of the unwholesome conditions in the industrial order that you must try to correct. In short, think of all evils precisely as you would act if you found yourself in their presence. There is no such thing as thinking about evil in a disinterested frame of mind. Whoever thinks about it at all takes a

definite side against it and cannot think about it on any other terms.

I said we would define sin. The only real definition of sin that I can think of is the one that Suzanna Wesley gave to her son John. "Take this rule," she said. "Whatever impairs the tenderness of your conscience, obscures your sense of God, or takes the relish off spiritual things that thing is sin to you, however innocent it may be in itself." Suzanna Wesley was not a theologian. She was just possessed with a lot of Christian common sense. (I could pray that every theologian would catch her spirit.) Jesus did not define sin, but he did know that something "impairs the tenderness of the conscience, obscures the sense of God, and takes the relish off spiritual things." From this men must be saved. There is certainly a "push" for the souls of men from which Jesus would rescue them. There is some peril to which men are exposed—peril enough to make him say, "I have prayed for you." And while Jesus did not define sin in the manner in which Suzanna Wesley defined it, he did illustrate it, which is far better. And if we want to preach to men, we must tell them as plainly as did Jesus what sin is. I do not know how many things he would regard as evil to-day, but I do know that by reading what he said, he gathered sin into at least four categories, and if men can be saved from them they will not be far from the Kingdom of Heaven.

To begin, there is the sin of *hardness*. Wordsworth speaks of the "little nameless unremembered acts of kindness and of love" that are "the best portion of a good man's life." Those on the right hand in the parable of the Last Judgment were instinctively kind, coming from the "overflow of the heart." Those on the left were instinctively hard. They committed nothing; they omitted everything that would provide a spiritual life for their fellow-men. Such people Jesus warns.

The second kind of sin against which Jesus warned, is

found in those people who would *like to do certain things if they could*, who at least are not unwilling to picture what they would like to do, if they could, and meanwhile enjoy the thought. They are not actual adulterers, they only wish they could be without being found out. They will stand horrified before a crime of kidnapping and murder which is done "just for fun," but will not hesitate to wish that certain people were out of the way, and take great satisfaction in knowing that calamity has befallen their enemy. It is not the act alone that Jesus condemns, but the color of the thoughts which dye and stain the mind.

The third group is found in those who merely *play at religion*. They tithe anise and mint and cummin, and forget judgment, mercy and faith. Jesus said the Pharisee never quite knew whether the creature he was looking at was a camel or a mosquito—he got them so mixed. The Pharisee does not live in a real world. He makes a good appearance, but is more concerned with the cleanliness of the outside, than with the heart out of which are the issues of life. He sets his prayers up as a smoke-screen to his villainy. He does not devour more widows' houses than the Publican of his day, but with this difference—the Publican does not tell himself any lies about it. The Pharisee lies to himself, and there is no greater dishonesty than the dishonesty of deceiving one's self. The Pharisee has no God, he creates One, and the God he creates is quite different from the One that is. The Pharisee God is a dummy God, some trifling being who can be humbugged. Against such Jesus warned. Bunyan sent Ignorance to hell. We do not like that term "hell," but where else was he to go? He would go there whether Bunyan sent him or not. Typhus germs send a man to death whether the physician wants him to go there or not. If a man jumps off a precipice, he goes to destruction, and that is all there is to it. Why reason otherwise when it comes to the moral realm? It is not difficult to see why Jesus was so lenient with gross and flagrant sinners,



and so exacting with Pharisees. The former certainly had need of God and they knew it. The latter, too, had need but were heedless of God's requirements.

We would hardly suppose that Jesus would let his condemnation rest upon the region where the intellect operates. And yet that is just what he did. He finds the fourth kind of sin among those who never really *make up their mind*. Dr. Fosdick speaks of the "sin of the belated mind." Perhaps we have forgotten that Jesus said, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy mind." "No man," he said, "having put his hand to the plow and looking backward is fit for the Kingdom of Heaven." This man is not bad. He is just "no good." He is static. The Kingdom of God is dynamic, and in the Kingdom of God there is no place for the nondescript. What part *can* there be in a Kingdom won on Calvary for people who cannot be relied upon, who cannot decide whether they ought to plough or not to plough, or who cannot make up their minds and stick to it?

I have dealt thus far with the problem of sin, for the obvious reason of showing that there is something from which we must be saved, for what is the reason of a Saviour if there is nothing to be saved from? The question, "Is Jesus Still the World's Saviour?" might imply that Jesus has grown obsolete, and that we need another kind of religion to save the world. Or, it might imply that modern theology has so far played havoc with the accepted traditional doctrines, such as the Virgin Birth, the Trinity, the Atonement, the Resurrection, the Ascension, and the giving of the Holy Spirit, that Jesus is no longer regarded as the Saviour, but merely as a great prophet and teacher—perhaps not even that. In other words, unless we hold to the faith once delivered to the saints, we may as well throw Jesus overboard altogether.

Well, I have no apologetic for the religion of Jesus. And I have no great philosophy to propound as to the Saviour-

hood of Jesus. The day for apologetics is over, indeed it should have been over before it started; and philosophers and theologians have succeeded so admirably and to such an extent in obscuring the religion of Jesus, that I do not care to make any further contribution in that direction. What I want to know, and what I think everyone needs to know is, What am I here for? Does it make any difference whether I am here or not? If it does make any difference, and if I know that certain things within me and in the universe are evil which God, Who is at the heart of the universe, recognizes to be evil, how can that evil be turned into good, and from whence can a stream of purifying water be turned upon that putrid thing which threatens to destroy me? In this place and in this world, is the place where I can show God that he has not made me for nothing! For this cause was I born and for this hour came I into the world.

## II. JESUS THE SAVIOUR

I lay it down as an axiom that Jesus is the Saviour, not because he was born of a Virgin; not because he performed miracles; not because he is the second Person in the Trinity; not because of any of these and many more reasons which the Church has given. But for far deeper reasons.

1. The first reason that I can assign for the Saviourhood of Jesus is, that *men have been changed*. When John the Baptist was languishing in prison, with waves of discouragement rolling over him, he sent and asked Jesus, "Art thou he that should come or look we for another?" Back came the answer, "The lame walk." That is reason enough. Since that time there have many lame persons who were made to walk and run without a limp. History is full of the record of the lives of such as these. I cannot here discuss the problem of forgiveness, but merely state the fact and let it speak for itself. There have been those who were *born* lame. The fathers ate sour grapes and the children's teeth were set on edge. Who dare say that in a

universe governed by God that moral defects must be? Indeed we dare say that moral defects need not be, for there are resources for their overthrow. There is in Jesus the power to rescue a man from the dead hand of ancestry. The Greeks wrestled with this problem, and they felt that if one of those fated ones would arise and be ready to suffer, ready to sacrifice her fair chance of life without complaining, that such a one would implant in the race a new and holy motive which would counteract the fatal drift and change it into a tide towards God. In some such sense Jesus arrested the tyranny of mere natural consequences. Apart from the significance which may be attached to the death of Jesus for the individual, there was impregnated into the world a new motive. There was let loose in the world a power which each hard-pressed soul of man can lay claim to, as a power in his own behalf, and believe that if he find it, it is more forceful than all that is against it. So that now men have had no need to say, "I have the moral defects of my father." There has been something that has come closer than the threatening of our natural blood; it is the spirit of Jesus.

There have been those who were lamed by *accident*. Men have found themselves hobbling through life because of their own sin. Somewhere along their life they did something that was wrong. Something held them prisoner like Bonnivard in Byron's *The Prisoner of Chillon*. He could hear the ripple of the waters of Lake Geneva, but he could not see them, for the only window of his cell was far away and far up. He became dead to the world; but one day a bird lighted on that window ledge and sang the sweetest song Bonnivard ever heard. It resurrected his dead heart. His homesick soul now longed as never to look once more into the face of his own native land. So Bonnivard for days, that grew into months, digged footholes into the walls of his dungeon. Painfully, slowly, he climbed up, up, until at last his eye was on a level with

the window, and he looked out again into the face of the great mountains of Switzerland and upon the waters of blue Geneva. Up, up, men have climbed until they looked into the face of God in Christ and were satisfied.

Some have been lamed because they *would not walk*. They were too lazy to walk. They have always been the hard ones with whom to deal, because the malady was in the region of the will. And Jesus never compelled the wills of men. But we know that something changed the will. I know of only one thing that can cure a naturally lazy man—that is shame. He may become ashamed of himself when he looks about and sees others who work. This has been true spiritually. However men have sunk back upon themselves and excused themselves, the fact that one day they saw Jesus who heard in life a far different call, made them ashamed of themselves.

"The Son of God goes forth to war,  
A kingly crown to gain;  
His blood-red banner streams afar:  
Who follows in his train?"

2. Jesus, too, is the Saviour, because he shows us God. He has no definition of God, but he assumes God, lives on the basis of God, interprets God; and God is discovered in his acts and relations. He said to Peter, "You think like a man, you don't think like God." Upon our idea of God will depend the kind of religion we have. Men are moulded by the thoughts they think and the desires they have. What Jesus was, was dependent upon his thought of God. "I always do the will of my Father in heaven," hence "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." Not every one in Jesus' day saw Jesus. They heard him, they looked upon his face, they saw his form, but they did not see *him*. Judas saw a man for whom he could bargain; Caiaphas saw a traitor to his country; the demoniacs saw a fiend who had come to torment them before their time; many of the Pharisees saw Beelzebub. We talk about the difficulty of seeing

God; but we ought to talk about the difficulty of seeing Jesus. It is just as difficult to see Jesus as it is to see God. For nineteen hundred years Jesus has been trying to get us to see himself. We have sung about him, opened conventions and conferences in his name, but to do as he says, and to see as he sees, and to find God as he found Him, are quite other things. What he has been trying to do is to get us into his frame of mind where we can think about God as he thought about Him. How shall we think about ultimate reality? What is behind all these changing, passing phenomena? What is back of it all? Is anybody? If so, is he wise or blind? Is he good or evil or indifferent? Does He mean anything, or is He only unreasoning, purposeless force?

Well, this is what he said: "Father." When you pray, say "Our Father." Begin with those words on your lips, with that thought in your mind, and with that filial spirit in your heart. When you worship, "Worship the Father in spirit and in truth." When you would turn away from the evil of your life, say "I will arise and go to my Father." When you want assurance in the great battles of life, say "No man can pluck me out of my Father's hand." When you come to die, say "Father into Thy hands I commend my spirit." "God," says Charles R. Brown, "combines the strength and the tenderness, the authority and the devotion, the responsible control and the capacity for self-sacrifice which belong to Fatherhood at its best. Take the highest you have ever seen in fatherhood and raise it to the nth power, and then trust that, for that is God."

Let us conclude this one aspect of the Saviourhood of Jesus—the revealing of God as Father—with an observation or two. Jesus will still be the world's Saviour on condition that Jesus' conception of God as Father is preached. Ruin by the Fall, Redemption by the Blood, Regeneration by the Holy Spirit, he never preached. He never spoke of a "pure doctrine," but of right practice and right living

and right character. The great directing force in religion is a right vision of God, and if our vision of God is the vision of Jesus, then we shall be led in the right way. Perfect Fatherhood in God was the very heart of the Evangel of Jesus. To lead us to that he lived, taught, labored, died. To miss that is to miss Jesus. The great blot on the Church's escutcheon is this fact—the fact that the universal Fatherhood of God, and the universal brotherhood of man, taught by Jesus, have been put into the discard, and the religion of Jesus has been superseded with doctrines about Jesus. And the supreme crime of the world has been and is, not that it fails to be religious, but its failure to wipe out false pictures of God—of the warrior God, the unjust God, the hard God—and put in their stead Jesus' conception of God as Father. The contrast between the old conception of God, and the conception which Jesus had is brought out in this little poem, "My Father and I":

My father prayed as he drew a bead on the grey-coats,  
Back in the blazing years when the house was divided.  
Bless his old heart there never was truer or kinder.  
Yet he prayed while hoping the bullet from his clumsy old musket  
Would thud to the body of some hot-headed young Southerner,  
And tumble him into the mud of the Vicksburg trenches.  
This was my father serving his God and his country.  
Praying and shooting whole-heartedly, never a doubt.

And now what about me and my day of battle and generation?  
Could I put my prayers behind a slim Springfield bullet?  
Hardly, except to mutter, "Jesus we part here."  
My country calls for my body and takes my soul also.  
Do you see those humans herded and driven against me?  
Turn away Lord, for I've got to kill them.  
To-day my business is killing,  
And my gods must be luck and the devil till this thing is over.  
Leave me now Lord, for your eye makes me slack in my duty.

My father could mix his prayers and his shooting.  
And he was a rare, true man in his generation.  
Now I am fairly decent in mine, I reckon.  
Yet if I should pray like him, I'd spoil it with laughing.  
What is the matter?  
My conception of God.

3. Jesus is the world's Saviour, too, only on condition that we heed his call to perfection and act on the belief that he meant what he said. Our difficulty is not to get people to believe that there is a God, and that Jesus lived and died. All this is assumed. Indeed, if you should stand in your pulpit next Sunday morning and deny anyone of these, you would likely find yourself without a Church. The Church would hardly tolerate a minister in its pulpit who had no vital belief in God and Jesus. But Jesus does not become the Saviour of the world merely because it is asserted that he is the Saviour, any more than water is life-giving without drinking it. What is the use of speculating as to the Saviourhood of Jesus unless there is a belief in the possibility of approximating to his perfection, and acting on the principle that he meant what he said?

In conversation some years ago with a woman on the subject of certain kinds of conduct, I told her that Jesus' ideals were thus and so. "But," she said, "Jesus was divine and we are not expected to be like him." Which was just another form of saying that for an idealistic religious genius those things are alright, but for the common man they are beyond his reach. We so frequently hear it said, "Oh, he is an idealist," as though idealism were something beyond the average human range, not ever meant to be practiced, but to be talked about.

Henrik Ibsen knew something of this when he wrote *Brand*. You perhaps recall the scene. It is in the first act. Brand is high up in the mountain snowfields. The mist lies thick and close; it is raining and nearly dark. A Peasant and his Young Son are a little way behind. The Peasant seeks to restrain Brand from going on because,

"Here's an abyss that none can sound;

"'Twill open and engulf us all."

But Brand says,



"A great one gave me charge, I *must*."

"What is his name?"

"His name is God."

"And what might you be, pray?"

"A priest."

"Turn back; don't be so stiff and stout;

A man has but a single life;—

What has he left if that goes out?"

But Brand goes on. The Peasant thinks he is crazy. But Brand turns to him:

"Hear Peasant; you at first professed,  
Your daughter at the fjordside lying  
Had sent you word that she was dying,  
But could not with a gladsome heart,  
Until she saw you, go to rest?"

"That's certain, as I hope for bliss!"

"And at her last day mentioned—this?"

"Yes."

"Not a later?"

"No."

"Then come."

"The thing's impossible—turn home."

"Listen! Would you give twenty pound

If she might have a blest release?"

"Yes, Parson."

"Forty?"

"House and ground

I'd gladly give away

If so she might expire in peace!"

"Would you also give your life?"

"What? life? My good friend—!"

"Well?"

"Nay, nay,

I draw the line somewhere or other—!

In Jesus' name, remember, pray,

At home I've children and a wife."

"He whom you mention had a mother."

"Aye, that was in the days of yore;—

Such things don't happen any more."

"Go home, you travel in death's track.

You know not God, God knows not you."

Yes, the things that Jesus said, are either fine, high-sounding phrases, or else they are practical in their applica-

tion. It is a dangerous thing to allow the sayings of Jesus to become mere platitudes constantly uttered from pulpits—things which must be said because a man is a preacher—without trying with all our might to get people to understand that they have meaning for them. “Be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect;” “Seek first the Kingdom of Heaven;” “Do unto others as ye would that men should do to you;” are frequently as meaningless to the present-day worshipper as they were to Tennyson’s “Northern Farmer” :

“An’ I never knowed what he meant, but I thowt he ‘ad summat to say,

An’ I thowt he said whot he ow’t to ‘a said, an’ I coom’d awaay.”

I think one of the outstanding present-day examples of real belief in the Saviourhood of Jesus of Nazareth, is found in the attitude of Mr. Arthur Nash. I have no disposition to tell all that is involved in the story of Mr. Nash’s sudden rise to success. In fact his success is a mere incidental in the story. We are concerned primarily with his acting upon the belief that Jesus meant what he said. Mr. Nash came to the conviction that a man’s real business was to seek first the Kingdom of God, and that if he were really seeking citizenship in the Kingdom of God, he would have to obey the Golden Rule in business. What would become of his business did not concern him. It was not for him to say, “Pray, I’ve a business and a family.” He, literally, as Jesus meant, sought first the Kingdom of God by acting upon the principle of the Golden Rule. If his business perished, all well and good. If it succeeded, all well and good again. That was secondary. His prime concern was God. What cared Jesus about things? The people were thinking in terms of things. Simkovitch says that Jesus was thinking in terms of insight. Mr. Nash caught Jesus’ insight.

Jesus may or may not be the Saviour of the world. It depends on the world. He may or may not be the Saviour

of the individual. It depends on the individual. What right have we to talk about the Saviourhood of Jesus in the abstract? The condition of Saviourhood lies in this: Are we willing to pay the price? Jesus had a strange way of bluntly questioning people about that. In the porches of Bethesda, for example, he once came upon a man who had a bleak and wintry life of it. "Do you want your health restored?" he asked. "Will you take it if I offer it to you? Do you really want what I can give you?" That is always the way Jesus went about. Always he kept asking, "Do you want it, will you have it, will you take it?" And like the world to-day, they frankly answered "No." "I can make you like myself," he said, "will teach you how to use your life as I spend mine." But they said, "We have no desire for that." His character was not for them. messing among the ordinary things of life. Beautiful, certainly, but quite unpractical! Such extreme views would never do in actual life. Unselfishness is all very well. But carried to such lengths is just impossible, would lead one into a dozen awkwardnesses every day in business, would make one's family life one long uncomfortableness.

Jesus is never a Saviour to a world that must be altered to suit our convenience, and we remain what we are. Salvation is free to everyone who takes the risk, but it means time, and pains and the concentrating of the energies upon a mighty task. You will not stroll into Christlikeness with your hands in your pockets, shoving the door open with a careless shoulder. Richard Cecil said, "You will not yawn yourself into heaven with an idle wish." It is a business for adventurous spirits. Would-be recruits who came up breathless and panting in their eagerness were asked by Jesus if they had the grit, the stamina, the gallantry, required.

Let us cease our glib talk about a certain event on Calvary two thousand years ago, and our singing,

"Christ for the world we sing,  
The world to Christ we bring,"

until we are willing to say to men, "You can have Christianity only upon the same condition that you get other things—that you want it bad enough to pay the price." You can't keep a world from that cross when it once has a desire to get there. What privations men have suffered to get an education! There was Alexander Whyte, lodging with two others in a little room with a bed that could hold only two of them, so that they took it turn about to sit and work, four hours a shift—all through the night, paying about 50 cents per week for their garret and their food, and yet spending on occasion \$15 for books, gathered from who knows where, and by what desperate privations! What can you do with men like that? You can't deny them, you can't hold them back. If they want it they'll get it, that's all. And if a man wants Christlikeness like that, in that greedy, venturesome, heroic spirit, he'll get it. Jesus, through the instrumentality of men, seeks to give the world that desire.

4. Jesus is the Saviour of the World of men because he shows us what religion is, by putting us into touch with the Power that helps us do the thing we know we ought to do. He who listens to the call "Follow me," must be prepared to follow him into some lonely places. The path which Jesus treads is a precipitous one, sometimes taking him to the sunlight heights of the Mount of Transfiguration, sometimes down into the fires of suffering and the shadow of death. To be saved means that when these dizzy heights are before you, and your path is beset by them, you will not go round them but through them. There is an arresting passage in the tenth chapter of Mark's Gospel: "And they were in the way, going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was moving on before them; and they began to wonder; and as they followed they began to be afraid." That's it. Even though you are afraid, are you loyal to the leader in front? Easy enough while the road runs by the shining shores of the Lake of Galilee, but not so easy when it turns into the Garden of Gethsemane and becomes the Via Doloroso.

Why then inquire into a man's doctrinal beliefs to find out if Jesus is his Saviour? Why make him subscribe to a certain formula of faith? A man's Salvation through Jesus is determined by what Jesus does for him. It is not a question either as to what a man should or should not do. Why tell a man always what he ought to do? He generally knows what he ought to do. When he goes to work on a Monday morning he knows pretty well how he ought to act. If a difficult situation arises which tries his temper, he knows what he should do in that instance. Unless a man is a total degenerate he knows what he should do when he is tempted to moral impurity. If a man's natural disposition is to strike an enemy and get even with him he knows that the better part would be to go on his way without taking revenge. A multiplicity of instances might be cited to show that most men have enough moral sense to know what they ought to do in the various experiences of life. The great problem is not to know what to do, but how to get the power to do what he knows he ought to do. St. Paul's great statement, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation," need not be clothed in a lot of theological speculation. It is the same statement that Dr. Jacks makes in his book, *Religious Perplexities*: "I will base my life on the assumption that somewhere, in the height above or in the depth below. Power is waiting to back me up. That Power, if I find it, shall be my God." This is the eternal quest of men, and Jesus shows the way. Let a man follow where Jesus goes, and "he will reveal himself in the toils, the conflicts, the sufferings which they shall pass through in his fellowship, and as an ineffable mystery, they shall learn in their own experience who he is."

And this gives to us that touch of mysticism which is so necessary in the salvation of all men. I can best give this idea by a few illustrations:

The first is found in the record of the last hours of Joan

of Arc. The Bishop of Bouvais asked her, "Do you believe that you are in a state of grace?" She replied, "If I am not, God will put me in it. If I am God will keep me in it." "Will you submit," asked the Bishop, "to the judgment of the Church militant?" "I have come," she replied, "to the king of France by commission from God and from the Church triumphant above; to that Church I submit." So they led her away to the place of execution, and from her funeral pyre she looked over the city of Rouen and said, "O Rouen, Rouen, I have great fear lest you suffer for my death." Then as the flames mounted higher—"Yes, my voices were of God! They have never deceived me! Jesus!" Just as the crowd was breaking up and falling away, an English soldier was heard to say, "We are lost, we have burnt a saint."

How or where Joan of Arc had heard the voice of God, or whether she was living under an hallucination, are questions which the theologian and psychologist may dispute, but no one will seriously question the statement of the soldier that they had burned a "saint." Somewhere she had found a power to help her do the thing she knew she ought to do in that dark hour.

In Conrad's novel *Chance*, we find a girl who, for the first fifteen years of her life had been sheltered in comfort and luxury. Then suddenly all the comfort and luxury were withdrawn. For ten years she tasted the humility which comes only to a dependent, the neglect and scorn of the world. There came a day when she found shelter in the affection of a lonely, tender-hearted sea captain. "The girl," says Conrad, "was, one may say, washing about with slack limbs in the ugly surf of life with no opportunity to strike out for herself. When suddenly she had been made to feel that there was somebody beside her in the bitter water, a most considerable moral event for her, whether she was aware of it or not." Yes, she had found a friend, and in finding a friend her moral need had begun

to be met. After all, life is a process of finding to what and to whom we belong, and when a man begins to find that out, he finds his other self.

In another novel by Conrad, *The Rescue*, we find a young man and a woman out on the open sea. He has rescued her. He put her on a boat. Then the awful struggle began. There were ninety-nine reasons why he should have her. There was one reason why he should not have her—the honor of his soul. The Captain came on deck with the question, "The other boat is sailing due North. Shall I steer North or South?" And the man answered, "Due South."

Men find their other selves in the comradeship of Jesus, and somewhere in the depths of the soul God lives to give a man the power to do what he knows he ought to do.

Down through these ages there has come a spirit, too, which has fastened itself upon the minds of men and of nations—a spirit which is not easily thrown off, no matter how far we seem to have wondered from its influence. It is the spirit of loyalty to the highest and deepest and best. And when men dig deep into their natures and draw up that loyalty, they will find it to be none other than the loyalty of Jesus of Nazareth to the highest demands of God. From somewhere comes the story that in Scotland in the first half of the last century, the coast lights had been built by a man by the name of Stevenson. He had one son. This son turned from engineering to letters. But in giving up his father's profession, he remained loyal to his father's spirit. He appealed to that which his father had done for strength to do what he had to do:

"Eternal granite hewn from the living Isle,  
And dowed with brute iron, rears a tower  
That from its wet foundation to its crown  
Of glittering glass, stands in the sweep of winds,  
Immovable, Immortal, Eminent.



These are thy works, O father, these thy crown,  
And while on high the air be pure, they shine  
Along the yellow sunset, and all the night  
Among the unnumbered stars of God, they shine;  
Until the stars vanish, till the sun return.  
This hast thou done, and I—can I be base?  
I must arise, O father, and to port  
Some lost complaining seaman pilot home."

Until some such loyalty to the principles of Jesus, some such desire to "carry on" in the face of difficulties, grips the souls of men and of nations, the name of Jesus will be mere sounding brass and clanging cymbals.

Who can tell all that is involved in getting the power to do the thing we know we ought to do? Dick Blaisdell, in Albert Parker Fitch's novel, *None So Blind*, was a dissolute, drunken senior in college. He had a struggle with himself. He was telling his room-mate of his last great battle with himself. "Dick," said Phil, "I'm outside of it. I don't want to be, but I can't help it. I don't want to be fooled! How can you be so sure?"

"Because it happened, Phil. It was as though I was turned upside down in some great place, or—or kingdom within. Everything that had been trying again, tonight, to get back on top, just sank, sank away down to the bottom. It ceased, disappeared. Something else that had been way down deep rose up, rose up—nothing could stop it now—and took command. No power on earth could have taken me to the Reynolds after that. I stopped the boys. 'What's up?' said Bob. 'I'm not going any farther. I can't.' 'Can't?' said Atwood. 'You're never going to back out now!' 'I'm not backing out, I loathe it. I can't do it.' I turned round and ran for a car. After I started running, I just raced for it. I didn't notice what car it was. It landed me out in Brighton and I walked over here."

"Dick, if it was so real, why can't you give it to some one else?"

"I guess you can't ever do that with things that are real, Phil. I guess every man has got to get them for himself. Anyway, the fight's won."

This mystic element, this power that makes for righteousness, this quest for reality, must be the experience of every man that is looking for the Power that is waiting to back him up.

We have said little about the cross, not because we minimize its significance, not because we want to get rid of it. You can't get rid of facts by saying you will get rid of them any more than the Hindu Priest could get rid of the germs of disease in the Ganges River by smashing the microscope. The cross is there. But you can't isolate it, and you can't see it set up by an arbitrary and omnipotent God. It was set up by men. Jesus could not escape it. He accepted it, and his acceptance of it is the crowning point in his victorious march. It is not the cross that conquers, it is Jesus. It is not a scheme or a plan that we need, but a Person. It is not the *how* of salvation, but the personality to whom we are attached—a personality with a cross at its center.

"O Iole! how did you know that Hercules was a god?" "Because," answered Iole, "I was content the moment my eyes fell on him. When I beheld Theseus, I desired that I might see him offer battle, or at least guide his horses in the chariot-race; but Hercules did not wait for a contest; he conquered whether he stood, or walked, or sat, or whatever thing he did."

How do we know that Jesus is the Saviour of the World? Because his personality conquers whether he stands or walks or sits, or whatever thing he does.

This is how he must have done it: He wished to save this world—this round, ailing, turbulent world. His Father said, "Are you prepared to pay the price, to leave all that you have, home and friends and dear ones?" And he said, "I am." Some months went by. "Are you still ready to meet the cost of it?" God asked. "Are you ready to

watch the crowds' deserting you, ready to face censure and ridicule and shame?" And without hesitation He replied, "I am." A year or two, and the ugly shadow of a cross fell full across his path. "Will you go on?" asked God. And he still said "I will." And by and by they nailed him down, and left him there to die, with nothing done, with scarcely one heart that really understood, his whole plan fallen into ruin, his dream become ridiculous. "Dare you pay the full price for it, now?" asked God. And he replied, "I do." And it is only because he did not falter, did not hang back, did not argue that he had done enough and gone far enough, and nothing had come of it, that it was hopeless, but laid down the uttermost that it could cost, that we are not still in our sins, and that the world is being saved.

READING, PA.

## NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS

*Conservatism, Radicalism, and Scientific Method, an Essay in Social Attitudes.* By A. B. Wolfe, Professor of Economics, Ohio State University. Pp. xiv. and 354. The Macmillan Company. 1923.

This remarkable volume presents a most thoughtful re-statement of the meaning of conservatism, radicalism and scientific method. Its avowed aim is to study the various social attitudes. "Conservatism and radicalism, scientific objectivity and the popular sentimentalism, democracy and class interest, individualism and socialism do not, of course, exhaust the list of social attitudes. Such a list would be as long as the catalogue of 'issues.' The above attitudes and the four-fold conflict which we have singled out for analysis, however, are all attitudes which will characterize the individual in whatever situation he may be placed or with whatever issues he may be confronted. They are those which it is most urgently needful at the present time to subject to a calm analysis and objective understanding." The author further says that "the main purpose of this book is to present a dispassionate analysis, as objective as I could make it, of the sources, characteristics, and the socio-ethical bearing of the attitudes treated." It was prepared for the classroom to meet the needs of college students. Its main chapter heads are interesting: I. Introduction, the Problem Stated. II. Conservatism and Radicalism—Definitions and Distinctions. III. Disinterested Conservatism. IV. The Motivation of Interested Conservatism. V. The Methods of Interested Conservatism. VI. The Motivation of Radicalism. VII. The Origins and Characteristics of Radicalism. VIII. The Methods of Radicalism. IX. Scientific Method and Scientific Attitude. X. Individualism and Democracy. XI. The Ethics of Conservatism and Radicalism. XII. The Present Situation and the Way Out.

"Whether we like it or not, we are all actors of a gigantic conflict of interests, with a plot of intricately confused and ill-understood attitudes, sentiments, inherited beliefs, attachments and loyalties; rebellious iconoclasms; thunderous clashes of economic institutions; apocalyptic murmurings of academic philosophies; by-play of ecclesiastical dogmatism; and cheap, melodramatic posings of self-appointed defenders of the faith and guardians of law and morality." It is a conflict between reactionaries and radicals, between democracy and class interests, individualism and socialism, sentimental and authoritative traditionalism and the scientific attitude and method.

The analysis of disinterested and interested conservatism is most thorough and remarkably fair in its evaluation. The same is true of radicalism. Both are conceived as attitudes and sentiments which lie at the root of the modern unrest and suffering. The need of an objective approach to reality is the paramount demand of the day. This is the vital element of the volume.

The critical reader would hardly need the frank statement of the author in the preface concerning a certain *a priori* assumption which dominates his treatment, namely, "the assumption of a consistent, mechanistic, deterministic view of nature, man and his social relations included." Continuing, he says, "I have been driven to this postulate because it seems to be the only one in accord with rational experience, and the only one which affords a sure basis of understanding of phenomena, both 'natural' and 'social.' Consistent with this deterministic position goes adherence to the behavioristic psychology as the only psychology which gives promise of consistent scientific quality."

The consistency of the treatment of this deterministic viewpoint is the real value of the book. Its proper companions among recent noteworthy books are John Dewey's *Human Nature and Conduct* and his *Reconstruction of Philosophy*; J. H. Robinson's *The Mind in the Making*; Edward

Scribner Ames' *Psychology of Religious Experience*. These are expressions of the same *a priori* mechanistic assumption. In connection with them C. A. Ellwood's *The Reconstruction of Religion, a Sociological View*, W. E. Hocking's *Human Nature and Its Remaking*, and his *The Meaning of God in Human Experience* and J. B. Pratt's *Religious Consciousness* might well be read. These maintain the *a priori* assumption of a living, dynamic universe. Our author has also written another book entitled, *Some Psychological Aspects of Industrial Reconstruction*. His general viewpoint is freely and fully revealed in the volume now under consideration. A critical estimate would necessarily involve a discussion of the reality and value of the mechanistic view of nature, man, and human relationships, which is not the purpose of such a brief review. The book merits careful reading. We recommend it especially to teachers and preachers. It clearly defines a viewpoint of our modern conflict which ought to be understood in order to appreciate its real contribution as well as to sense its shortcomings.

E. S. BROMER.

*The Religious Experience of John Humphrey Noyes, Founder of the Oneida Community*. Compiled and edited by George Wallingford Noyes. Pp. xiii and 416. The Macmillan Company, New York. 1923.

The compiler and editor of this book promises the publication of another in the near future. This one gives an account of the early life and personal religious experience of John Humphrey Noyes; the other will describe the communistic community, its social expression, known in history as the Oneida Community.

John Humphrey Noyes was born September 6, 1811, at Battleboro, Vermont; studied theology at Andover and Yale and became a Congregational minister. He founded a sect known as Perfectionists and established a community of Bible Communists at his parents' home in Putney, Vt.

After a period of persecution and inner dissension the community at Putney was disbanded and reorganized later at Oneida, N. Y. All property was held in common; religious rites were given up and "complex marriages" recognized. Noyes wrote *The Berean* (1847); *Bible Communism* (1848); and *History of American Socialism* (1870). He died in 1886.

The present volume is interesting not only as a study of the religious experience of John Humphrey Noyes but of American Christianity in the period of 1810 to 1850. The reaction against a severe static Puritanism broke out in various directions of Unitarianism, Perfectionism, and Universalism. Corresponding with the individual religious experience was its social expression in various forms of communistic experiments ranging from the famous Brook Farm of the Unitarian Transcendentalists to the Oneida Community of the Perfectionists.

The author aims to compile and edit the diary, letters, writings of John Humphrey Noyes in such a way as virtually to present an autobiography. From the literary point of view it is but an average piece of work. The style is stilted and the arrangement of material mechanical. The editor, however, succeeds quite well in describing the genesis and growth of the religious experience of Reverend Noyes, the main roots of which are his direct experience of God in Christ, the second coming of Christ at the end of the Jewish dispensation in the first century and his coming at the end of the Gentile dispensation, and the possibility and fact of Christian perfection in personal and social experience.

This volume and its promised companion will be valuable as source material in the study of the development of Christianity and democracy in the United States. Modern conditions raise the issue of religion and democracy in a new way. Social Christianity and scientific socialism are joining hands. A new study of the various communistic experiments in America is being made. The New England



Theocracy, the Jamestown Colony, the Shakers, the Harmonists, the German Baptists, the Amana Community, the Icarians, the Oneida Community, the Mormons, the Brook Farm, and some of the more recent attempts are all a reflex of the great modern movement toward democracy. Their religious origin is the one significant fact common to them all. All of them have been opposed to war. Will a renewed study of these communities and founders add anything of value to the scientific sociology of our day? Does the Christian experience of God in Christ have any relation to the social hope of humanity is the interesting question raised by such studies as the one given in the present volume. Writing of American Communism Professor Ely says, "It has accomplished much good and little harm. Its leaders have been actuated by noble motives, have many times been men far above their fellows in moral stature, and have desired only to benefit their kind. Its aim has been to elevate man and its ways have been ways of peace."

It is, however, only necessary to read such a volume as Professor C. A. Ellwood's *The Reconstruction of Religion, a Sociological View*, to note how great is the difference between the religious mysticism of John Humphrey Noyes and the modern scientific method as an approach to modern social democracy and the solution of the problems of human progress.

E. S. BROMER.

*The Fourth "R," the Forgotten Factor in Education.* By Homer S. Bodley. 271 pp. Fleming H. Revell Company, 1923. Second Edition.

The separation of Church and State and the adoption of universal compulsory education in a public school system has imposed a difficult task on the educational practice and religious institution of our country; namely, the task of maintaining the unity of experience and life in the individual and society. That the national system of public education and the present divided condition of the churches have failed

to maintain this unity is the opinion of the author. Righteousness is the great fourth "R," forgotten in the past and yet essentially necessary to a balanced education. He assumes a generic, undenominational religion and ethics, acknowledging the advance of science and democracy, and thus universal for all men. Religion, patriotism and humanity are one in experience.

The book takes the form of a reading book, so arranged in chapters that "it may be taken up for study under the various heads for use as a text-book." The table of contents indicates the comprehensive scope of the readings: Part I. The Material Universe. Part II. The Physical and the Mental Life. Part III. The Sociological Life. Part IV. Some of the Arts of Life. Part V. The General Purpose of Life. VI. Quotations from the Psalms. Part VII. Psychology of the Fourth "R."

In a popular way the author weaves the fact of God, providence, life, love, and work into a religious viewpoint of the world. The fact that this is the second edition of the book is a mark of appreciation on the part of teachers and general readers. The theistic hypothesis and its applications are quite naïve at times and would be seriously questioned by many leading educators. It is a book for public school teachers. Its main idea and the challenge implied may not be questioned.

E. S. BROMER.

*Romanism as a World Power.* By Luther S. Kauffman, published by True American Publishing Company, 311 Victory Building, Philadelphia, Pa. Price \$1.00.

This is a book of only 81 pages but it is full of important and in some instances of startling information. It contains the amplified substance of an address delivered by the author before the Philadelphia, New Jersey and Vicinity Methodist Episcopal Preacher's Meeting. The author discusses his subject under a dozen or more sub-titles and supports and illustrates his contentions with numerous quotations from Catholic and Protestant sources.

He shows that the original Colonies were predominantly Christian and Protestant. Maryland, however, was mainly a Catholic Colony, and the claim has been made that it was the first to establish religious toleration. The author shows the claim to be without foundation. The charter granted to the Virginia Colony by the King of England made the Church of England its established religion. When Lord Baltimore petitioned the King for a charter for a colony he granted him a portion of the territory of Virginia. Legally that would have placed the Catholic colony of Maryland under the Church of England. In order to obviate the difficulty the King in granting the charter to Lord Baltimore stipulated the freedom of religion for his Colony. It was Protestant toleration for the benefit of Catholics, not the reverse. The Roman Church by the very nature of its doctrine and organization cannot be tolerant of Protestant Churches; and when it exercises toleration it does not do so by its own wish and will but by compulsion from circumstances and conditions over which it has no control.

The Roman Church is an absolute Monarchy of which the Pope is the sovereign head; and it claims for him sovereignty not only over his church but over all mankind both here and hereafter. This judgment is based upon such words of its advocates as the following:

"The Pope is crowned with a triple crown as King of Heaven, of Earth, and of Hell."

Of this claim the author remarks: I think he is trying to cover too much territory.

"The Church is rightly named a SOVEREIGN STATE."

"Well-informed Catholics bear in mind that the Pope is not only their spiritual father in Christ, *but also a crowned Head, a King with temporal possessions.*"

"On account of the excellence of his supreme dignity he is called Bishop of Bishops, Ordinary of Ordinaries, Universal Bishop of the Church, Bishop or Diocesan of the whole world, Divine Monarch, Supreme Emperor, and King of Kings."

The book abounds of other quotations of the same general tenor. The conceptions of education held by Catholics and their attitude towards the public schools are set forth by quotation such as the following:

"The best ordered and administered state is that in which the few are well educated and lead, and the many are trained to obedience, are willing to be directed, content to follow and do not aspire to be leaders."

"We believe that the peasantry, in old Catholic countries, two centuries ago, were better educated; although for the most part unable to read and write, than are the great body of American people to-day."

"That the devil is in the public schools, raging and rampant there among the pupils as well as among the teachers, no one can well doubt," etc.

"Yes, continue a little longer to educate the greater part of the community according to the present system of public schools, and rest assured we shall soon have hell upon earth," etc.

"The introduction of State education has everywhere been attended by an enormous increase of crime which can be attributed to no other cause."

The author declares this last statement, though made by a "holy priest," to be absolutely false, and from the records taken from the courts and various institutions shows clearly that pro rata a larger number by far of crimes and criminals belong to the Catholic Church than to any other body of citizens.

Are the Catholics of our country looking forward to and preparing for a military conflict with the government? The book gives such quotations as these in answer to this question.

"I want to say that when the time comes in this country, *as it surely will come*, and the same forces attack the Church here they will find us not unprepared nor unorganized, and they shall not prevail. We have well ordered and efficient

organizations all at the beck and nod of the Hierarchy and ready to do what the Church Authorities tell them to do." Words of Monsignor Capel: "The time is not far away when the Roman Catholic Church of the Republic of the United States, at the order of the Pope, will refuse to pay their school tax; will send bullets to the breasts of government agents, rather than pay it. It will come as quick as the trigger and will be obeyed, of course, as coming from God Himself."

The quotations given in this notice are intended to show the manner pursued by the author of the book in the treatment of his general subject. More than one half of the main portion of the book consists of quotations from various authorities. The names of the writers, speakers, books, and pages are carefully given which makes the treatment authoritative. The subject of marriage, titles granted by the Pope creating a nobility amongst us, the extra-territorial rights allowed the Catholic Church by our government, and other pertinent questions are treated in the same definite, clear, and concise manner. The book is not of the sensational kind, and yet it seems to me that if all the Protestant Ministers and intelligent laymen would read this book and carefully study the subject of which it treats a sensation of no mild order would be created. It is the opinion of the writer that it ought to be widely circulated. It can be procured through the Publication Board of the Reformed Church at the Schaff Building, 15th and Race Sts., Philadelphia.

A. E. TRUXAL.

*Beginners' Logic.* By R. H. Dotterer, Associate Professor of Logic and Philosophy in the Pennsylvania State College. Pages 342. The Macmillan Company, New York.

*Latent Religious Resources in Public School Education.* A Study in Correlation on the Curriculum Side. By C. A. Hauser, D.D., Ph.D. Pages 319. The Heidelberg Press, Philadelphia.

*One Thousand Bible Readings.* A Guide to Bible Readings. By Rev. D. J. Wetzel. Pages 57. Price \$1. The Macmillan Company, New York.

*Early Years and Late Reflections.* By Emil P. Herbeck, D.D. Pages 257. Illustrated. Price \$2. Central Publishing House, Cleveland, Ohio.

The REVIEW takes special pleasure in bringing to the attention of its readers these four books, whose authors are members of the Reformed Church. They differ widely in content. Three of them were written by young men, while the fourth comes from the pen of a Nestor. But each of them has its distinctive merits, and forms a welcome addition to the collection of books whose title pages bear names that are familiar to most of our readers.

Professor Dotterer combines, in rare degree, profundity of thought with clarity of expression. Moreover, he brings to his task a wealth of specialized knowledge in the wide field of the mental sciences, that is the fruit of years of study, and the wisdom that is the outcome of practical experience as a teacher. Accordingly he has written a *Beginners' Logic* that is bound to gain wide recognition as a thoroughly good textbook. Indeed, while the technical character of his book will of necessity limit its circulation, I venture the assertion that almost the whole of it would prove delightful, and highly instructive, reading for the average layman. Treatises on "formal logic" are not usually classed as popular literature. The reviewer freely confesses that, with few exceptions, their authors have been at great pains to make utterly impossible such a classification. Even in colleges, their laborious pedantry has served to eclipse the true merit of an important science. But Dr. Dotterer's textbook belongs to the notable exceptions. And in this small group it belongs in the front rank, for the freshness and wealth of its material and for the lucid skill of its presentation. It is to be hoped, most earnestly, that so good a book will find its way into many a school and college, for the great benefit of teacher and student.

Dr. Hauser's book, *Latent Religious Resources in Public School Education*, represents his thesis for the degree of

doctor of philosophy in the Graduate School of the University of Pennsylvania. It is an original study of the highest value for the promotion of religious education. The author is well known to our readers as the Editor of the Educational Publications of the Publication and Sunday School Board of the Reformed Church. He is one of the intelligent and devoted champions of a cause that is fast winning its way to the foremost place in the heart of organized Christianity.

The purpose of Dr. Hauser's book is "to bring into closer personal relationship two groups of educators who should become more intimately acquainted with each other's important field of work. These two groups are the public school teachers and the Church school teachers." Both groups are engaged upon the vital task of educating the childhood and youth of America. But, hitherto, the author holds, there has been no intelligent coöperation between them. Accordingly, there has been a sad waste of religious resources, latent in public school education. The author sees very clearly that the problem of religious education in America will never be solved by establishing a formal alliance between Church and State. But with equal clearness, he sees the urgent need of establishing the closest possible coöperation between the educational forces of both. And he affirms that "the form of coöperation that will be most effective, and least subject to criticism, is a correlation of curriculum material. Such correlation can be made effective through a knowledge on the part of each group of leaders, of the teaching material available in both types of schools." Such, in brief, is the aim and purpose of Dr. Hauser's excellent book.

The volume consists of two parts, together with several appendixes and a selected bibliography. In Part I, the author discusses his main theme, Latent Religious Resources in Public School Education, as it relates to educational aims and objectives. In Part II, he discusses the theme as it



finds its application in the Public School Courses of Study, based on the schools of the city of Philadelphia, which are regarded as being typical. For definite reasons, stated in his preface, the author bases his suggested correlation on the "Five Forms of Control," as these are elaborated by Professor A. Duncan Yocum. That particular scheme has its decided merits, though it will not meet with universal approval. But the intrinsic worth of Dr. Hauser's investigation does not at all depend upon this alliance. That rests securely on its own foundation of careful and fruitful study, and of deep insight into a very vital aspect of religious education.

The reviewer desires to recommend this book very heartily to all persons engaged, or interested, in education. It is a pioneer in a new field, ready and ripe for rich harvests.

The Reverend D. J. Wetzel has given us a book whose slender girth is wholly disproportionate to its value. Its modest title is, *One Thousand Bible Readings*. In a sub-heading we are told that this guide to Bible Readings has been "especially arranged and adapted for use in the Public Schools, also for Church Aid and Young People's Societies Mission Circles, and the Home Altar." Much thoughtful labor has gone into the making of this little book. It is not merely a haphazard collection of biblical passages. It is a fine selection of the materials that are most suitable for the avowed aim of the book. There are two brief prefatory chapters on The Purpose of the Book, and How to Use the Book. The body of the book contains, A Biblical Index to the Old Testament, with four main divisions (Historical-Biographical Narratives, Biographical Narratives, Poetic and Didactic, Prophetic); A Biblical Index to the New Testament, with three main divisions (Gospels, Acts, Epistles); A Topical Index. There is also a chapter devoted to Lessons for Special Days and Seasons; an Index to the Biblical Subjects Listed, and to the Books of the Bible Listed.

The reviewer finds nothing to criticize and much to commend in this small volume. It certainly meets a present need, and its field of useful service is almost unlimited. And it will be a most welcome gift to multitudes in schools, homes, and churches who love the Book of Books, and who need a competent guide for intelligent and purposive reading.

Dr. Emil P. Herbruck is the pastor emeritus of one of our largest congregations in Ohio. Most of the chapters that form his book were originally published in *The Christian World*. But they were well worth preserving in this more permanent form, both for their intrinsic charm and for their historical material. The author belongs to a family that, for several generations, has played a prominent part in the making of Reformed History in the Middle West. Very fittingly, much space is given in these *Reflections and Reminiscences* to the Rev. Peter Herbruck, one of the sturdy pioneers who helped to lay the foundations of our Church in Ohio. But the reader will discover that the author himself is the worthy son of a noble sire, who walked and worked steadfastly and successfully in the path blazed by his father.

This reviewer is especially grateful to the author of this volume for the chapter devoted to Calvin College, which enshrines the memory of Dr. J. H. Ruetenik, one of the truly great teachers of our Church, whose name deserves to be held in perpetual honor. But the whole Church is indebted to Dr. Herbruck for his delightful contribution to our literature. It contains the "Look Backward" of a man who has looked at life long and keen, whose labors were many, and whose years were spent in devoted service of God and man. And it contains the "Look Upward" of a heart serene in its faith and waiting for its coronation. Such a book is always worth reading. Historians and chroniclers will glean its facts, and all the rest of us will rejoice in its sane philosophy of life.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

*Book 3748a*

